

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

G 2

& 42)

S 71

THE GANDHI SUTRAS

BY

D. S. SARMA, M.A.,
Principal, Pachaiyappa's College, Madras

1938

PRINTED BY
G. S. PRESS, MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS



“ I am a man of peace, I believe in peace. But I do not want peace at any price. I do not want the peace that you find in stone. I do not want the peace that you find in the grave ; but I do want that peace which you find embedded in the human breast which is exposed to the arrows of a whole world, but which is protected from all harm by the Power of the Almighty God.”

MAHATMA GANDHI.

“ Let then our first act every morning be to make the following resolve for the day :

I shall not fear anyone on earth.

I shall fear only God.

I shall not bear ill-will towards any one.

I shall not submit to injustice from any one.

I shall conquer untruth by Truth.

And in resisting untruth I shall put up with all suffering.”

MAHATMA GANDHI.

Other works by the same author :

**THE BHAGAVAD GITA (WITH INTRODUCTION,
TRANSLATION AND NOTES).**

THE KATHOPANISHAD AND THE GITA.

THE GITA AND SPIRITUAL LIFE.

THE GOSPEL OF LOVE (NARADA SUTRAS).

A PRIMER OF HINDUISM.

HINDUISM TODAY.

HOW IT STRIKES A HINDU.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	xi
THE GANDHI SUTRAS	
FIRST CHAPTER	
1. अथ नवयुगाधर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः ॥ १ ॥	1
2. धर्मस्यैव सनातनस्य नवोल्लेखः ॥ २ ॥	"
3. ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वमिति श्रूयते ॥ ३ ॥	2
4. सत्यस्वरूपस्सर्वेश्वरः ॥ ४ ॥	5
5. सत्ये संदृष्टे सिद्धिरात्मनः ॥ ५ ॥	7
6. सर्वदा सर्वभावेन सत्यमेव भजनीयम् ॥ ६ ॥	"
7. नेह संदृश्यते सत्यं परम् ॥ ७ ॥	8
8. अस्ति सत्ये विप्रतिपत्तिः ॥ ८ ॥	9
9. तस्मान्नात्र कार्यो निर्बन्धः ॥ ९ ॥	10
10. अहिंसा परमो धर्मः ॥ १० ॥	"
11. तयैव सत्यसिद्धिः ॥ ११ ॥	14
12. सर्वप्राणिमनःकायहिंसानिवृत्तिरहिंसा ॥ १२ ॥	15
13. सौहार्दं च सर्वप्राणिषु ॥ १३ ॥	"
14. तद्धि गवां संरक्षणम् ॥ १४ ॥	16
15. गौरित्युपलक्षणं तिरश्चां सर्वेषाम् ॥ १५ ॥	"

	PAGE
16. सौम्रात्रं च मनुष्येषु ॥ १६ ॥	20
17. तेषु केचिदस्पृष्टा इत्येतन्महापातकम् ॥ १७ ॥	„
18. एते हरिजना इति ब्रूमः ॥ १८ ॥	23
19. कुतस्तेषां देवायतनप्रवेशादिष्वनधिकारः ॥ १९ ॥	24
20. वर्णाश्रमधर्मविभागेष्वपि नोत्कर्षापकर्षभेदः ॥ २० ॥	27
21. प्रेमैव परं रूपमहिंसायाः ॥ २१ ॥	31
22. तदेव मूलं गृह्यधर्माणाम् ॥ २२ ॥	33
23. प्रपञ्चः खलु कुटुम्बमीशस्य ॥ २३ ॥	„
24. अतो गृह्यधर्मएव प्रपञ्चधर्मः ॥ २४ ॥	„
25. प्रेमैव भेषजं द्वेषस्य ॥ २५ ॥	34
26. तस्य विलासो निर्भयस्यैव हृदये ॥ २६ ॥	„
27. हिंसापि क्लैब्याच्छेयसी ॥ २७ ॥	35
28. अहिंसा तु श्रेष्ठा ॥ २८ ॥	37
29. अहिंसा नित्यो धर्मः, हिंसा तु नैमित्तिक एव ॥ २९ ॥	46
30. धीरस्वार्थैवाचरत्यहिंसाम् ॥ ३० ॥	41
31. यावद्दुःखं सहते तावदुपकरोति ॥ ३१ ॥	42
32. थावद्विशुद्धं सहनं तावत्येव सिद्धिः ॥ ३२ ॥	43
33. न हि सिद्धिस्त्यागेनाप्यसंयतस्य ॥ ३३ ॥	44
34. परोपकार एव यज्ञः, एषवोऽस्त्विष्टकामधुक् ॥ ३४ ॥	45
35. अयज्ञस्सन् यो भुङ्क्ते स्तेन एव सः ॥ ३५ ॥	48
36. स्वस्वरूपाच्च्युत एव नरो जायते, च्युतस्ततोऽप्युद्धहते ॥ ३६ ॥	49

CONTENTS

	vii PAGE
37. ब्रह्मचर्येणैव तस्य मोक्षः ॥ ३७ ॥	49
38. उद्वाहोऽपि प्रजायै न तु कामोपभोगाय ॥ ३८ ॥	53
39. धनस्य सञ्चयो हि दुरितस्य सञ्चयः ॥ ३९ ॥	54
40. सर्वदा सर्वत्र सेवितव्यो दरिद्रनारायणः ॥ ४० ॥	55
41. माननीयाः खलु कृषीवलाः ॥ ४१ ॥	57
42. अवस्करवाहाश्च ॥ ४२ ॥	59
43. कृषिवयने हि ग्रामश्रियः पादद्वयम् ॥ ४३ ॥	62
44. तन्तुचक्रमेव मूलाधारम् ॥ ४४ ॥	64
45. तन्तुकरणं हि विशुद्धं कर्म सर्वेषां हितं सुकरं च ॥ ४५ ॥	66
46. ग्रामाभ्युदयादेव देशाभ्युदयः ॥ ४६ ॥	69
47. स्वदेशवस्तूपयोगाभिनिवेश एव प्रारम्भस्त्यागस्य ॥ ४७ ॥	72
48. न शोभते शिल्पं बाह्यरूपमात्रेण ॥ ४८ ॥	78
49. न शब्दार्थावधारणमेव विद्या ॥ ४९ ॥	82
50. स्वविद्यैव प्रधानं इतरास्तु तदङ्गानि ॥ ५० ॥	87
51. स्वधर्मेऽभिमतिः परधर्मे चाभिरतिः ॥ ५१ ॥	90
52. यस्मात्सर्वे धर्मास्सत्यस्य शाखाः ॥ ५२ ॥	93

SECOND CHAPTER

53. सत्याग्रह इति धर्मस्यैव सनातनस्य नवोल्लेखः ॥ ५३ ॥	95
54. सत्याग्रह एव सत्यशक्तिः प्रेमशक्तिरात्मशक्तिश्च ॥ ५४ ॥	100
55. प्रतिष्ठा स एव लोकस्य ॥ ५५ ॥	101
56. तस्य चलनादेव संघर्षः ततश्चरित्रारम्भः ॥ ५६ ॥	„

	PAGE
57. "अनेनैव ज्योतिषा निरस्यते निखिलदौर्जन्यान्धकारः ॥ ५७ ॥	102
58. "जायते हि दौर्जन्यं राष्ट्रात्संघात्पुरुषाद्वा ॥ ५८ ॥	103
59. "सर्वात्मना दौर्जन्यस्य निरसनमेव सत्याग्रहः ॥ ५९ ॥	"
60. अघृष्यस्तेनैव भवत्यात्मा ॥ ६० ॥	"
61. न कदाचिदपि पराजयस्तस्य ॥ ६१ ॥	104
62. तत्र प्रमादाक्लेशस्तदनुष्ठातुरेव ॥ ६२ ॥	"
63. न निश्चयोऽस्मिन्नेव जन्मनि सिद्धिस्सत्याग्रहिण इति ॥ ६३ ॥	105
64. मरणेन स महीयानेव भवति ॥ ६४ ॥	"
65. आत्माभिव्यक्तिसाधनमेव देहः ॥ ६५ ॥	"
66. अभयप्रदानमन्तरेण सत्याग्रहो दुराग्रहः ॥ ६६ ॥	106
67. निर्बन्धोऽपि दुराग्रहः ॥ ६७ ॥	107
68. तथैव बहिष्कारस्संघात् ॥ ६८ ॥	108
69. स्वार्थाय प्रायोपवेशश्च ॥ ६९ ॥	110
70. अजातशत्रुस्सत्याग्रही ॥ ७० ॥	111
71. अनशनव्रतेन ईश्वरप्रणिधानेन च सत्यं जानाति ॥ ७१ ॥	"
72. ईश्वर एव तस्य निवासश्शरणं सुहृत् ॥ ७२ ॥	114
73. महात्मनां च पन्थानमनुसरति ॥ ७३ ॥	"
74. पन्थानं प्रह्लादनन्दप्रभृतीनाम् ॥ ७४ ॥	115
75. तथैव नागनारायणवल्लीनां च ॥ ७५ ॥	117
76. सत्यं शीलं दमस्थैर्यं निर्भयत्वं च नम्रता । ऐकमत्यं शमस्त्यागस्सहिष्णोस्सहजा गुणाः ॥ ७६ ॥	118

THIRD CHAPTER

	PAGE
77. सत्याग्रहोऽयं वटः अनन्तास्तस्य शाखाः ॥ ७७ ॥	119
78. असहकारोद्यमस्तत्रैका ॥ ७८ ॥	"
79. शासनोलङ्घनं द्वितीया ॥ ७९ ॥	121
80. सहकारे पापसंभिन्ने असहकार एव परमो धर्मः ॥ ८० ॥	124
81. स एव सम्यगनुष्ठितः निरूढं प्रेम भवति ॥ ८१ ॥	125
82. पारुष्यसहितश्चेत्कलुषी भवति ॥ ८२ ॥	127
83. पारुष्यरहितश्चेत्कालुष्योन्मूलको भवति ॥ ८३ ॥	"
84. धर्मात्मा राजनीतिषु धर्ममेवाचरति ॥ ८४ ॥	"
85. एकैकः पौरस्तास्वधिकृतः ॥ ८५ ॥	128
86. राजनीतौ हि संवृतिदोषः ॥ ८६ ॥	"
87. शठं प्रति शाठ्यमिति तिलकः ॥ ८७ ॥	129
88. शठं प्रत्यपि सत्यमिति गान्धिः ॥ ८८ ॥	"
89. त्वासाविष्टा शिष्टिर्न स्थातुमर्हति ॥ ८९ ॥	131
90. तथैव या द्यूतमद्यदिकमनुमन्यते ॥ ९० ॥	"
91. प्राणदण्डमपि दुर्जनशिष्टेस्सुजनो वृणीते ॥ ९१ ॥	133
92. असहकारोद्यमे सर्वेऽप्यधिकारिणः शासनोलङ्घने कतिचनैव ॥ ९२ ॥	134
93. शासनोलङ्घने शासनानुवर्तिन एवाधिकारिणः ॥ ९३ ॥	"
94. न ह्यस्मादराजकत्वमधर्मो वा ॥ ९४ ॥	135
95. अहिंसाश्रितत्वात् ॥ ९५ ॥	136

	PAGE
96. निर्व्याजं निरवज्ञं निर्मदं निरसूयं निरवद्यमेवेदं भवति ॥ ९६ ॥	136
97. एकोऽपि शासनोलङ्घको विशुद्धश्चेदधर्मान्मूलनस्य प्रभवति ॥ ९७ ॥	137
98. प्रजानां शासनोलङ्घनं यद्यहिंसापरं निरोद्धुं न शक्यम् ॥ ९८ ॥	138
99. प्रजानां दौर्जन्यं तु राज्ञां दौर्जन्यादधिकतरभयहेतुः ॥ ९९ ॥	"
100. परिज्ञाते प्रमादे ततः प्रतिनिवृत्य पुनस्सुपथैवानुवर्तनं धर्मः ॥ १०० ॥	"
101. नेता समूहैर्न नीयेत ॥ १०१ ॥	139
102. राष्ट्राभ्युदयः श्रयस्संजायते क्रमिकपरिणामेन ॥ १०२ ॥	"
103. आकस्मिकेन परिवर्तनेन वा ॥ १०३ ॥	"
104. सत्याग्रहएव शस्त्रं भारतीयानाम् ॥ १०४ ॥	140
105. अनेनैव तेषां स्वाराज्यसिद्धिः ॥ १०५ ॥	142
106. सत्ययुगं शनैरभ्येति जगत्सर्वम् ॥ १०६ ॥	145
107. तन्मार्गदर्शि भारतवर्षम् ॥ १०७ ॥	"
108. दिक्कालाद्यनवच्छिन्नस्सनातनोऽयं धर्मः ॥ १०८ ॥	146

INTRODUCTION

An American tourist once said that he came to India to see three things—the Himalayas, the Taj Mahal and Mahatma Gandhi. We in this country stand too near Mahatma Gandhi to see his personality in its true proportions or to understand the significance in human history of what he calls his experiments with Truth. He has himself declared that his message is universal, though it is delivered in India and in terms of Indian politics. But politics is the least part of the man whose ultimate aim is to lift the human species to a higher moral and spiritual plane.

We have witnessed in our own age the triumphs of aviation. We hear every day of adventurous men and women who fly from continent to continent across thousands of miles of land and sea without in the least minding the terrible risks involved in such an undertaking. The invention of the aeroplane and its swift adoption by the nations of the earth for the purposes of war and peace have, as we all know, opened a new page in history. But Mahatma Gandhi's invention is far more important to mankind than the aeroplane and will have a momentous influence on their fortunes in the centuries to come. For his Satyagraha is nothing but spiritual aero-nautics. When it is properly understood and correctly practised it would enable not only individuals but also nations to fly away from the tiger and the ape in man in the direction of that mysterious perfection of all spiritual values.

which we call God. Some people may laugh today at his doctrine of non-violence or what he calls the soul-force and may ask what will happen to it when it has to face a machine gun or an incendiary bomb. Evidently they have not understood the story of Christianity. They only remind us of the member of Parliament—he must have been one of the Liberals—who in a discussion about the newly invented railway locomotive asked what would happen to it if it was attacked on the proposed road by an angry cow. But a hundred years hence—or probably a thousand years hence, for man is still an infant in the kingdom of the spirit—when all the present military dictators of Europe and those who think like them will have long been dust in their graves and the barbarous armaments which they are piling up have gone the same way, the spiritual weapon forged by this frail Hindu will have been universally adopted and the nations of the earth will bless him for having pointed out to them a higher and a better way—a way which alone is really worthy of human beings. Then he will be recognised by all as a true messenger of God, whose message, like that of Buddha, Christ or Muhammad, is not confined to one country or nation.

But the aim of this book is not to correlate his message with that of the other great teachers of mankind or to show in what respects he represents an advance from them in the march of the spirit. It is the more modest one of giving his teaching the traditional form of the teachings of the other great sages of India who have preceded him and who have made Hinduism what it is.

Hinduism is the oldest of living religions. It has an unbroken record of over forty centuries. Its book of

revelations is not closed. It ever contemplates the proclamation of new gospels, the promulgation of new laws and the advent of new prophets and avatars. In a word, it is a progressive realisation of Truth. And today it is passing through a period of Renaissance and a memorable chapter is being added to its history. For Mahatma Gandhi, who is a true incarnation of Hindu spirituality and in the direct line of descent from the ancient Rishis, is re-interpreting its eternal truths and applying them in a marvellously original manner to the conditions of the modern world. His gospel of Satyagraha, as he himself says, is only an extension and an application of the fundamental Hindu doctrine of Ahimsa to all national and international problems. No other country in the world than India has the requisite religious background for the extending and the implementing of this great doctrine which is calculated to release the divinity in man. His idea of Swaraj, which is to be won by non-violence and in which all religions would have equal treatment and all communities equal rights and privileges, is only an expression in political terms of the Hindu doctrine—*Ekam sad vipra bahudha vadanti*. The great movement he has started for the abolition of untouchability and the removal of the inequalities of the modern caste system has for its object the restoration to its original purity of the spirit of Varnasrama Dharma, which according to him is the greatest communism on earth. His passionate plea for the revival of the spinning wheel and the handloom in the villages of India as well as his argument for total prohibition in this country is a reminder to us of the character of Indian civilization which has to be preserved at all costs. And, above all,

his method of religious approach to all political and social problems and his insistence on Truth and Non-violence in every sphere of life and his recognition of the spiritual unity of all men even in the details of every day life are aspects of Hinduism at its best. Moreover by his ascetic habits, his fasts and penances and his life of renunciation he has upheld the ancient Hindu ideals of Brahmacharya, Tapasya and Vairagya in the modern world in which there is so much to corrupt every sense. Thus both by precept and by example Mahatma Gandhi is pointing the way to a future of Hinduism which will be really worthy of its past. Undoubtedly he is one of the greatest creative personalities in the history of this religion and his speeches and writings will form part of the sacred books of Hindus. Therefore an attempt is made in the following pages to express his teachings in the form of Sutras in the language in which most of the Hindu scriptures are written—viz., Sanskrit.

The Sutra is a literary form peculiar to India. It is a mnemonic formula from which every unnecessary word is removed. It is, as it were, the distilled essence of learning. At a time when there were no books and all teaching was oral the Sutra was a convenient means of consolidating and preserving knowledge. A bare collection of Sutras would be like the paragraph headings in a long discourse. Without the oral instruction or the written commentary that accompanies it a Sutra would often be unintelligible. There are Sutras in Sanskrit on almost all subjects. But the most popular, of course, are the Vedanta Sutras of Badarayana which condense into a number of aphorisms the whole philosophy of Vedanta. The great Acharyas, Sankara, Ramanuja, Madhva and

owners, have written extensive commentaries on them interpreting them according to the tenets of their own schools.

Following at a great distance the ancient models in Sutras I have tried with the kind help of some friends,* who are Sanskrit scholars, to condense the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi into one hundred and eight Sutras, so that he who gets them by heart may have the whole teaching at his fingers' ends. The Gandhi Sutras are divided into three chapters. The first chapter gives the general principles, the second deals with Satyagraha and the third with Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience, the two main branches of Satyagraha. Each Sutra is followed by an English translation, and in place of the traditional commentary extracts from Mahatma Gandhi's own speeches and writings bearing on the point are given, wherever necessary. In giving these extracts I have taken the liberty of omitting as far as possible all references to particular incidents, places or persons and of abridging some of the passages quoted. It is my earnest hope that the Sutras would prove a convenient form for those who like to view Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy as a whole or to commit its general principles to memory.

* Sri. M. R. Rajagopala Aiyangar, Sri. K. Gopalakrishnamma and Mahamahopadhyaya S. Kuppuswami Sastriar.

THE GANDHI SUTRAS

FIRST CHAPTER

अथ नवयुगधर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः ॥ १ ॥

1. We now proceed to expound the Dharma of the new age.

धर्मस्यैव सनातनस्य नवोल्लेखः ॥ २ ॥

2. It is only a new interpretation of the ancient Dharma.

“I claim to be a humble servant of India and humanity and would like to die in the discharge of such service. I have no desire to found a sect. I am really too ambitious to be satisfied with a sect for a following, for I represent no new Truths. I endeavour to follow and represent Truth, as I know it. I do claim to throw a new light on many an old Truth.”—*Young India*, August 25, 1911.

“My preaching and teaching are not emotional or impractical, for I teach what is ancient and strive to practise what I preach. And I claim that what I practise is capable of being practised by all, because I am a very ordinary mortal open to the same temptations and liable to the same weaknesses as the least among us.”—*Young India*, December 15, 1927.

ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वमिति श्रूयते ॥ ३ ॥

3. The Veda says : "The Universe is pervaded by God."

"Many of you, I think, know the Ishopanishad. I read it years ago with translation and commentary. I learnt it by heart in Yervada Jail. But it did not then captivate me, as it has done during the past few months, and I have now come to the final conclusion that if all the Upanishads and all the other scriptures happened all of a sudden to be reduced to ashes and if only the first verse* in the Ishopanishad were left intact in the memory of Hindus, Hinduism would live for ever."—*Harijan*, January 30, 1937.

"Those who know a little bit of Sanskrit will find that there is nothing abstruse there that you find in other Vedic mantras, and its meaning is simply this. All that there is in this Universe, great or small, including the tiniest atom, is pervaded by God, known as Creator or Lord. Isha means the Ruler, and He who is the Creator naturally by very right becomes the Ruler too. And here in this verse the seer has chosen no other epithet for the Deity but that of the Ruler and he has excepted nothing from His jurisdiction. He says everything that we see is pervaded by the Deity and from that naturally the other parts of the mantra follow."—*Harijan*, January 30, 1937.

"I suggest to you that the truth that is embedded in this very short mantra is calculated to satisfy the highest

* The verse is :—"All this—whatever there is in this universe—is pervaded by God. Renounce it and enjoy. Do not covet the wealth of another."

cravings of every human being—whether they have reference to this world or to the next. I have in my search of the scriptures of the world found nothing to add to this mantra. Looking back upon all the little I have read of the scriptures—it is precious little, I confess—I feel that everything good in all the scriptures is derived from this mantra. If it is universal brotherhood—not only brotherhood of all human beings, but of all living beings—I find it in this mantra. If it is unshakable faith in the Lord and Master and all the adjectives you can think of, I find it in this mantra. If it is the idea of complete surrender to God and of the faith that He will supply all that I need, then again I say I find it in this mantra. Since He pervades every fibre of my being and of all of you, I derive from it the doctrine of equality of all creatures on earth, and it should satisfy the cravings of all philosophical communists. This mantra tells me that I cannot hold as mine anything that belongs to God, and if my life and that of all who believe in this mantra has to be a life of perfect dedication, it follows that it will have to be a life of continual service of our fellow creatures.”—*Harijan*, January 30, 1937.

“There is an indefinable mysterious power that pervades everything. I feel it, though I do not see it. It is this unseen power which makes itself felt and yet defies all proof, because it is so unlike all that I perceive through my senses. It transcends the senses..... Sense perceptions can be, and often are, false and deceptive, however real they may appear to us. Where there is realisation outside the senses, it is infallible. It is proved not by extraneous evidence but in the transformed conduct and character of those who have felt the real presence of God within.

Such testimony is to be found in the experiences of an unbroken line of prophets and sages in all countries and climes. To reject this evidence is to deny oneself.”
—*Young India*, October 11, 1928.

“It can never be a matter for argument. If you would have me convince others by argument I am floored. But I can tell you this—that I am surer of His existence than of the fact that you and I are sitting in this room.

Then I can also testify, that I may live without air and water but not without Him. You may pluck out my eyes, but that cannot kill me. You may chop off my nose, but that will not kill me. But blast my belief in God, and I am dead.”—*Harijan*, May 14, 1938.

“I claim to be a man of faith and prayer and even if I was cut to pieces, God would give me the strength not to deny Him and to assert that He is. The Muslim says, He is and there is no one else. The Christian says the same thing and so the Hindu, and if I may say so, even the Buddhist says the same thing, if in different words. We may each of us be putting our own interpretation on the word God—God who embraces not only this tiny globe of ours but millions and billions of such globes. How can we, little crawling creatures, so utterly helpless as He has made us, how could we possibly measure His greatness, His boundless love, His infinite compassion, such that He allows man insolently to deny Him, wrangle about Him, and cut the throat of his fellowman? How can we measure the greatness of God who is so forgiving, so divine?—*Young India*, December 8, 1927.

सत्यस्वरूपस्सर्वेश्वरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. God is Truth.

"The word 'Satya' (Truth) is derived from 'Sat' which means being. And nothing is or exists in reality except Truth. That is why 'Sat' or Truth is perhaps the most important name of God. In fact, it is more correct to say that Truth is God, than to say that God is Truth. But as we cannot do without a ruler or a general, names of God such as King of Kings or the Almighty are and will remain more usually current. On deeper thinking, however, it will be realised that 'Sat' is the only correct and fully significant name for God.

And where there is Truth, there also is knowledge, pure knowledge. Where there is no Truth, there can be no true knowledge. That is why the word 'Chit' or knowledge is associated with the name of God. And where there is true knowledge, there is always bliss (Ananda). Sorrow has no place there. And even as Truth is eternal, so is the bliss derived from it. Hence we know God as 'Sat-chit-ananda,' One who combines in Himself Truth, Knowledge and Bliss."—*From Yerravda Mandir, Pages 1-2.*

"To me God is Truth and Love; God is ethics and morality; God is fearlessness. God is the source of Light and Life and yet He is above and beyond all these. God is conscience. He is even the atheism of the atheist. For in His boundless love God permits the atheist to live. He is the searcher of hearts. He transcends speech and reason. He knows us and our hearts better than we

do ourselves. He does not take us at our word for He knows that we often do not mean it, some knowingly and others unknowingly. He is a personal God to those who need His personal presence. He is embodied to those who need His touch. He is the purest essence. He simply IS to those who have faith. He is all things to all men. He is in us and yet above and beyond us. One may banish the word 'God' from the Congress, but one has no power to banish the Thing itself. What is a solemn affirmation if it is not the same thing as 'in the name of God'? And surely conscience is but a poor and laborious paraphrase of the simple combination of three letters called God. He cannot cease to be because hideous immoralities or inhuman brutalities are committed in His name. He is long suffering. He is patient, but He is also terrible. He is the most exacting personage in the world and the world to come. He metes out the same measure to us that we mete out to our neighbours—men and brutes. With Him ignorance is no excuse. And withal, He is ever forgiving for He always gives us the chance to repent. He is the greatest democrat the world knows, for He leaves us unfettered to make our own choice between evil and good. He is the greatest tyrant ever known, for He often dashes the cup from our lips and under cover of free will leaves us a margin so wholly inadequate as to provide only mirth for Himself at our expense. Therefore it is that Hinduism calls it all His sport, Lila, or calls it an illusion, Maya. We are not, He alone IS. And if we will be, we must eternally sing His praise and do His will. Let us dance to the tune of his bansi, lute, and all would be well."—*Young India*, March 5, 1925.

सत्ये संहृष्टे सिद्धिरात्मनः ॥ ५ ॥

5. When Truth is seen there is self-realisation.

“To find Truth completely is to realise oneself and one's destiny, i.e., to become perfect. I am painfully conscious of my imperfections and therein lies all the strength I possess, because it is a rare thing for a man to know his own limitations.”—*Young India*, November 17, 1921.

सर्वदा सर्वभावेन सत्यमेव भजनीयम् ॥ ६ ॥

6. Worship Truth at all times with all your heart.

“Devotion to this Truth is the sole reason for our existence. All our activities should be centred in Truth. Truth should be the very breath of our life. When once this stage in the pilgrim's progress is reached, all other rules of correct living will come without effort, and obedience to them will be instinctive. But without it, it would be impossible to observe any principles or rules in life.

Generally speaking, observing the law of Truth is merely understood to mean that we must speak the Truth. But we in the Ashram understand the word Satya or Truth in a much wider sense. There should be Truth in thought, Truth in speech, and Truth in action. To the man who has realised this Truth in perfection, nothing else remains to be known, because all knowledge is necessarily included in it. What is not included in it is not Truth, and so not true knowledge; and there can be no inward peace without true knowledge. If we once learn how to apply this never-failing test of Truth, we will at once be able to find out what is worth doing, what

is worth seeing, what is worth reading.”—*From Yeravda Mandir*, Pages 2-3.

“I am also an orthodox Hindu in the sense in which the author of the Mahabharata, the great Vyasa, would have it. He has said somewhere in the Mahabharata to this effect: Put Truth in one scale and all sacrifices whatever in the other; that scale which contains Truth will outweigh the one that contains all the sacrifices put together, not excluding Rajasuya and Ashvamedha Yajna. And if the Mahabharata may be accepted as the fifth Veda, then I can claim to be an orthodox Hindu, because every moment of the twenty four hours of my life I am endeavouring to follow Truth counting no cost as too great.”—*Young India*, December 15, 1927.

नेह संदृश्यते सत्यं परम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. The highest Truth cannot be perceived in this life.

“But it is impossible to realise perfect Truth so long as we are imprisoned in this mortal frame. We can only visualise it in our imagination. We cannot, through the instrumentality of this ephemeral body, see face to face Truth, which is eternal. That is why one has ultimately to fall back on faith.”—*From Yeravda Mandir*, Page 9.

“I claim to have no infallible guidance or inspiration. So far as my experience goes, the claim to infallibility on the part of a human being would be untenable, seeing that inspiration too can come only to one who is free from the action of pairs of opposites, and it will be difficult to judge on a given occasion whether the claim to freedom from pairs of opposites is justified. The claim to infallibility would thus always be a most dangerous claim to make. This, however, does not leave us without

any guidance whatsoever. The sum-total of the experience of the sages of the world is available to us and would be for all time to come. Moreover there are not many fundamental truths, but there is only one fundamental Truth, which is Truth itself, otherwise known as Non-violence. Finite human beings shall never know in its fulness Truth and Love, which is in itself infinite. But we do know enough for our guidance. We shall err, and sometimes grievously, in our application. But man is a self-governing being and self-government necessarily includes the power as much to commit errors as to set them right as often as they are made."—*Young India*, April 21, 1927.

अस्ति सत्ये विप्रतिपत्तिः ॥ ८ ॥

8. Opinions differ about truth.

"In spite, however, of such devotion, what may appear as truth to one person will often appear as untruth to another person. But that need not worry the seeker. Where there is honest effort, it will be realised that what appear to be different truths are like apparently different countless leaves of the same tree. Does not God Himself appear to different individuals in different aspects? Still we know that He is one. But Truth is the right designation of God. Hence there is nothing wrong in every one following Truth according to one's lights. Indeed it is one's duty to do so. Then if there is a mistake on the part of any one so following Truth, it will be automatically set right. For the quest of Truth involves Tapas—self-suffering, sometimes even unto death. There can be no place in it for even a trace of self-interest. In such selfless search for Truth nobody can

lose his bearings for long. Directly one takes to the wrong path one stumbles, and is thus redirected to the right path. Therefore the pursuit of Truth is true Bhakti (devotion). It is the path that leads to God, and therefore there is no place in it for cowardice, no place for defeat. It is the talisman by which death itself becomes the portal to life eternal."—*From Yerravda Mandir, Pages 4-5.*

तस्मान्नात्र कार्यो निर्बन्धः ॥ ९ ॥

✓ 9. So there should be no compulsion in this.

"The golden rule of conduct, therefore, is mutual toleration, seeing that we will never all think alike and that we shall always see Truth in fragments and from different angles of vision. Conscience is not the same thing for all. Whilst, therefore, it is a good guide for individual conduct, imposition of that conduct upon all will be an insufferable interference with everybody else's freedom of conscience."—*Young India, September 23, 1926.*

अहिंसा परमो धर्मः ॥ १० ॥

10. Non-violence is the highest Law.

"Non-violence is a perfect state. It is a goal towards which all mankind moves naturally, though unconsciously. Man does not become divine when he personifies innocence in himself. Only then does he become truly man. In our present state, we are partly men and partly beasts, and in our ignorance and even arrogance say that we truly fulfil the purpose of our species, when we deliver blow for blow and develop the measure of anger

required for the purpose. We pretend to believe that retaliation is the law of our being. Whereas in every scripture we find that retaliation is nowhere obligatory, but only permissible. It is restraint that is obligatory. Retaliation is indulgence requiring elaborate regulating. Restraint is the law of our being. For highest perfection is unattainable without highest restraint. Suffering is thus the badge of the human tribe."—*Young India*, March 9, 1920.

"The world is full of Himsa, and Nature does appear to be red in tooth and claw. But if we bear in mind that man is higher than the brute, then is man superior to that Nature. If man has a divine mission to fulfil, a mission that becomes him, it is that of Ahimsa. Standing as he does in the midst of Himsa, he can retire into the innermost depths of his heart and declare to the world around him that his mission in this world of Himsa is Ahimsa, and only to the extent that he practises it does he adorn his kind. Man's nature then is not Himsa but Ahimsa, for he can speak from experience his innermost conviction that he is not the body but Atman, and that he may use the body only with a view to expressing the Atman, only with a view to self-realisation. And from that experience he evolves the ethics of subduing desire, anger, ignorance, malice and other passions, puts forth his best effort to achieve the end and finally attains complete success. Only when his efforts reach that consummation can he be said to have fulfilled himself, to have acted according to his nature. Conquest of one's passions, therefore, is not superhuman, but human. Observance of Ahimsa is heroism of the highest type with no room therein for cowardice or weakness."—*Young India*, June 24, 1926.

"I have not the capacity for preaching universal non-violence to the country. I preach therefore non-violence restricted strictly to the purpose of winning our freedom and therefore perhaps for preaching the regulation of international relations by non-violent means. But my incapacity must not be mistaken for that of the doctrine of non-violence. I see it with my intellect in all its effulgence. My heart grasps it. But I have not yet the attainments for preaching universal non-violence with effect. I am not advanced enough for the great task. I have yet anger within me. I have yet the *Dwaita Bhava* quality in me. I can regulate my passions. I keep them under subjection, but before I can preach universal non-violence with effect I must be wholly free from passions. I must be wholly incapable of sin. Let the revolutionary pray with and for me that I may soon become that. But meanwhile let him take with me the one step to it which I see as clearly as daylight i.e., to win India's freedom with strictly non-violent means."—*Young India*, March 7, 1925.

"Ahimsa is a weapon of matchless potency. It is the *summum bonum* of life. It is an attribute of the brave, in fact it is their all. It does not come within reach of the coward. It is no wooden or lifeless dogma but a living and a life-giving force. It is the special attribute of the soul. That is why it has been described as the highest dharma (law). In the hands of the educationist, therefore, it ought to take the form of the purest love ever fresh, an ever-gushing spring of life expressing itself in every act. Ill-will cannot stand in its presence. The sun of Ahimsa carries all the hosts of darkness such as hatred, anger and malice before himself."—*Young India*, September 6, 1928.

"All life in the flesh exists by some *himsa*. Hence the highest religion has been defined by a negative word *ahimsa*. The world is bound in a chain of destruction. In other words, *himsa* is an inherent necessity for life in the body. That is why a votary of *ahimsa* always prays for ultimate deliverance from the bondage of the flesh. None, while in the flesh, can thus be entirely free from *himsa*, because one never completely renounces the will to live. Of what use is it to force the flesh merely if the spirit refuses to co-operate? You may starve even unto death, but if at the same time the mind continues to hanker after objects of the sense, your fast is a sham delusion. What then is the poor helpless slave to the will-to-live to do? How is he to determine the exact nature and the extent of *himsa* he must commit? Society has no doubt set down a standard and absolved the individual from troubling himself about it to that extent. But every seeker after truth has to adjust and vary the standard according to his individual need and to make a ceaseless endeavour to reduce the circle of *himsa*.—*Young India*, October 4, 1928.

"I am not a visionary. I claim to be a practical idealist. The religion of non-violence is not meant merely for the Rishis and Saints. It is meant for the common people as well. Non-violence is the law of our species, as violence is the law of the brute and he knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law to strengthen the spirit. I have therefore ventured to place before India the ancient law of self-sacrifice."—*Young India*, August 11, 1920.

"Many have shaken their heads as they have said, 'But you cannot teach non-violence to the masses. It is only possible for individuals and that too in rare cases.' This is, in my opinion, a gross self-deception. If mankind was not habitually non-violent, it would have been self-destroyed ages ago. But in the duel between forces of violence and non-violence the latter have always come out victorious in the end. The truth is that we have not had patience enough to wait and apply ourselves whole-heartedly to the spread of non-violence among the people as a means for political ends.—*Young India*, January 2, 1930.

"Non-violence is the greatest force at the disposal of mankind. It is mightier than the mightiest weapon of destruction devised by the ingenuity of man. Destruction is not the law of the humans. Man lives freely only by his readiness to die, if need be, at the hands of his brother, never by killing him."—*Harijan*, July 20, 1935.

तयैव सत्यसिद्धिः ॥ ११ ॥

11. It is the only means to Truth.

"It is perhaps clear from the foregoing that without *Ahimsa* it is not possible to seek and find Truth. *Ahimsa* and Truth are so intertwined that it is difficult to disentangle and separate them. They are like the two sides of a coin or rather of a smooth unstamped metallic disc. Who can say which is the obverse and which is the reverse? Nevertheless *Ahimsa* is the means. Truth is the end."—*From Yeravda Mandir*, Page 14.

"If I were asked to define the Hindu creed I should simply say, search after Truth through non-violent

means. A man may not believe even in God and still call himself a Hindu. Hinduism is a relentless pursuit after Truth and if to-day it has become moribund, inactive, irresponsive to growth, it is because we are fatigued, and as soon as the fatigue is over, Hinduism will burst forth upon the world with a brilliance perhaps unknown before.”—*Young India*, April 10, 1924.

सर्वप्राणिमनःकायहिंसानिवृत्तिरहिंसा ॥ १२ ॥

12. Non-violence is abstention from causing pain to any creature either in its mind or body.

“We seem to think that we have fully carried out the doctrine of *ahimsa* so long as we do not actually kill. In my opinion this is a travesty of *ahimsa*. Every act of injury to a living creature and endorsement of such act by refraining from non-violent effort, wherever possible to prevent it, is a breach of *ahimsa*.”—*Young India*, August 30, 1928.

सौहार्दं च सर्वप्राणिषु ॥ १३ ॥

13. It also means love to all animals.

“The chief value of Hinduism lies in holding the actual belief that ALL LIFE (not only human beings, but all sentient beings) is one, i.e., all life coming from one universal source—call it Allah, God or Parameswara.”—*Harijan*, December 16, 1936.

• “Future measurements will take note not merely of the human family but of all that lives, and even as we are slowly but surely discovering that it is an error to suppose that Hindus can thrive upon the degradation of

a fifth of themselves or that peoples of the West can rise or live upon the exploitation and degradation of the Eastern and African nations, so shall we realise in the fulness of time, that our 'dominion over the lower order of creation is not for their slaughter, but for their benefit equally with ours. For I am as certain that they are endowed with a soul as that I am.'—*Young India*, December 17, 1925.

तद्धि गवां संरक्षणम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. It is the protection of the cow.

गौरित्युपलक्षणं तिरश्चां सर्वेषाम् ॥ १५ ॥

15. For the cow symbolizes all animals.

"Cow-protection to me is one of the most wonderful phenomena in human evolution. It takes the human being beyond his species. The cow to me means the entire sub-human world. Man through the cow is enjoined to realise his identity with all that lives. Why the cow was selected for apotheosis is obvious to me. The cow was in India the best companion. She was the giver of plenty. Not only did she give milk, but she also made agriculture possible. The cow is a poem on pity. One reads pity in the gentle animal. She is the mother to millions of Indian mankind. Protection of the cow means protection of the whole dumb 'creation of God. The ancient seer, whoever he was, began with the cow. The appeal of the lower order of creation is all the more forcible because it is speechless. Cow-protection is the gift of Hinduism to the world. And Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the cow."—*Young India*, October 6, 1921.

"As I have said before in these pages, for me the cow is the purest type of sub-human life. She pleads before us on behalf of the whole of the sub-human species for justice to it at the hands of man, the first among all that lives. She seems to speak to us through her eyes, (let the reader look at them with my faith) "You are not appointed over us to kill us and eat our flesh or otherwise ill-treat us, but to be our friend and guardian."—*Young India*, June 26, 1924."

"I ventured to lay down the conditions of cow-protection which are well worth repeating :—

1. Every such institution should be situated out in the open, where it is possible to have plenty, *i.e.*, thousands acres of open ground capable of growing fodder and giving exercise to the cattle. If I had the management of all the *goshalas*, I should sell the majority of the present ones at handsome profits and buy suitable plots in the vicinity except where the existing places may be needed for mere receiving depots ;

2. Every *goshala* should be turned into a model dairy and a model tannery. Every single head of dead cattle should be retained and scientifically treated and the hide, bones, entrails, etc. should be used to the best advantage. I should regard the hide of dead cattle to be sacred and usable as distinguished from the hide and other parts of slaughtered cattle, which should be deemed to be unfit for human use or at least for Hindu use ;

3. Urine and dung in many *goshalas* are thrown away. This I regard as criminal waste ;

4. All *goshalas* should be managed under scientific supervision and guidance ;

5. Properly managed, every *goshala* should be and can be made self-supporting, donations being used for its extension. The idea is never to make these institutions profit-making concerns, all profits being utilised towards buying maimed and disabled cattle and buying in the open market all cattle destined for the slaughter-house ;

6. This consummation is impossible if the *goshalas* take in buffaloes, goats, etc. So far as I can see, much as I would like it to be otherwise, not until the whole of India becomes vegetarian, can goats and sheep be saved from the butcher's knife. Buffaloes can be saved if we will not insist upon buffalo's milk and religiously avoid it in preference to cow's milk. In Bombay, on the other hand, the practice is to take buffalo's milk instead of cow's milk. Physicians unanimously declare that cow's milk is medically superior to buffalo's milk, and it is the opinion of dairy experts that cow's milk can by judicious management be made much richer than it is at present found to be. I hold that it is possible to save both the buffalo and the cow. The cow can be saved only if buffalo breeding is given up. The buffalo cannot be used for agricultural purposes on a wide scale. It is just possible to save the existing stock, if we will cease to breed it any further. It is no part of religion to breed buffaloes or, for that matter, cows. We breed for our own uses. It is cruelty to the cow as well as to the buffalo to breed the latter. Humanitarians should know that Hindu shepherds even at the present moment mercilessly kill young male buffaloes, as they cannot profitably feed them. To save the cow and her progeny—and that only is a feasible proposition—the Hindus will have to forego

profits from the trade concerning the cow and her products, but never otherwise. Religion to be true must satisfy what may be termed humanitarian economics, i.e., where the income and the expenditure balance each other. The attainment of such economics is just possible with the cow and the cow only with the assistance of donations for some years from pious Hindus. It should be remembered that this great humanitarian attempt is being made in the face of a beef-eating world. Not till the whole world turns predominantly vegetarian is it possible to make any advance upon the limitations I have sought to describe. To succeed to that extent is to open the way for future generations to further effort. To overstep the limitation is to consign the cow for ever to the slaughter-house in addition to the buffalo and the other animals.

Hindus and the humanitarian societies in charge of goshalas and pinjrapoles, if they are wisely religious, will bear the foregoing conditions of cow-protection in mind and proceed immediately to give effect to them.”—*Young India*, March 31, 1927.

“Now I am not ready to believe that by merely protecting the animal, cow, one can attain *Moksha*. For *Moksha* one must completely get rid of one’s lower feelings like attachment, hatred, anger, jealousy, etc. It follows, therefore, that the meaning of cow-protection in terms of *Moksha* must be much wider and far more comprehensive than is commonly supposed. The cow-protection which can bring one *Moksha* must, from its very nature, include the protection of everything that feels.”—*Young India*, January 20, 1925.

सौभ्रात्रं च मनुष्येषु ॥ १६ ॥

16. It also comprises the brotherhood of all men.

"I do not believe that an individual may gain spiritually and those who surround him suffer. I believe in *advaita*, I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives. Therefore I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him, and if one man falls, the whole world falls to that extent."—*Young India*, December 4, 1924.

तेषु केचिदस्पृश्या इत्येतन्महापातकम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. To say that some men are untouchables is a heinous sin.

"Whilst I am prepared to defend, as I have always done, the division of Hindus into four castes, I consider untouchability to be a heinous crime against humanity. It is not a sign of self-restraint but an arrogant assumption of superiority. It is a sin of which the sooner Hinduism purges itself the better it is for itself, if it is to be recognised as an honourable and elevating religion. I know no argument in favour of its retention, and I have no hesitation in rejecting scriptural authority of a doubtful character in order to support a sinful institution."—*Young India*, December 8, 1920.

"If untouchability was a part of the Hindu creed, I should decline to call myself a Hindu and most decidedly embrace some other faith, if it satisfied my highest aspirations. Fortunately for me, I hold that untouchability is no part of Hinduism. On the contrary, it is a serious blot upon it, which every lover of it must sacrifice him-

self to remove. Suppose, however, I discovered that untouchability was really an integral part of Hinduism, I should have to wander in the wilderness, because the other creeds, as I know them through their accepted interpreters, would not satisfy my highest aspirations.”
—*Young India*, April 10, 1924.

“ I speak with a due sense of my responsibility that this untouchability is a curse that is eating into the vitals of Hinduism, and I often feel that unless we take due precautions and remove this curse from our midst, Hinduism itself is in danger of destruction. That in this age of reason, in this age of wide travel, in this age of a comparative study of religions, there should be found people, some of whom are educated, to uphold the hideous doctrine of treating a single human being as an untouchable or unapproachable or unseeable because of his birth, passes my comprehension. As a lay humble student of Hinduism, and claiming to be one desirous of practising Hinduism in the spirit and to the letter, let me tell you that I have found no warrant or support for this terrible doctrine. Let us not deceive ourselves into the belief that everything that is written in Sanskrit and printed in Shastra has any binding effect upon us. That which is opposed to the fundamental maxims of morality, that which is opposed to trained reason, cannot be claimed as Shastra, no matter how ancient it may be. There is enough warrant for the proposition that I have just stated in the Vedas, in the Mahabharata and in the Bhagavad Gita.”—*Young India*, October 20, 1927.

. “What though a man drinks, kills cows and eats carrion ? He is no doubt an evil-doer, though no greater

than the one who commits secret and more deadly sins. But he is not to be treated as an untouchable even as society does not treat the secret sinner as one. Sinners are not to be despised, but pitied and helped to rid themselves of their sinfulness. The existence of untouchability among Hindus is a denial of the doctrine of Ahimsa on which we pride ourselves. We are responsible for the evils among the untouchables. What have we done to wean them from their ways? Do we not spend a fortune to reform members of our own families? Are the untouchables not members of the great Hindu family? ”—*Young India*, March 13, 1926.

“If the untouchables are so because they kill animals and because they have to do with flesh, blood, bones, and night-soil, every nurse and every doctor should become an untouchable, and so should Christians, Mussalmans and all the so-called high-class Hindus who kill animals for food or sacrifice.

The argument that, because slaughter-houses, toddy shops and houses of ill fame are or should be isolated, untouchables should likewise be isolated betrays gross prejudice. Slaughter-houses and toddy shops are and should be isolated. But neither butchers nor publicans are isolated. Prostitutes should be isolated because their occupation is revolting and detrimental to the well-being of society. Whereas the occupation of untouchables is not only desirable but a necessity for the well-being of the society.”—*Young India*, July 29, 1926.

“I met the untouchables there and I prayed that day as I have done today. I do want to attain *moksha*. I do not want to be reborn. But if I have to be reborn, I

should be born an untouchable, so that I may share their sorrows, sufferings and the affronts levelled at them in order that I may endeavour to, free myself and them from that miserable condition. I therefore prayed that, if I should be born again, I should do so not as a Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya or Shudra, but as an Atishudra.” —*Young India*, April 27, 1921.

“This removal of untouchability is not to be brought about by any legal enactment. It will only be brought about when the Hindu conscience is roused to action and of its own accord removes the shame. It is a duty the touchables owe to the untouchables.” —*Young India*, June 30, 1927.

“The fight against untouchability is a religious fight. It is a fight for the recognition of human dignity. It is a fight for a mighty reform in Hinduism. It is a fight against the entrenched citadels of orthodoxy. Victory which is a certainty is worth the patience and the sacrifice the band of devoted young Hindus is giving to it. The process of waiting is a process of self-purification for the young men engaged in the fight. If they persist they will be ranked among the makers of India of the future.” —*Young India*, February 5, 1925.

एते हरिजना इति ब्रूमः ॥, १८ ॥

18. We declare them to be Harijans.

“Only the other day a friend suggested to me that the word Harijana (man of God) be substituted for the word “antyaja” (the ‘last born’) that is being used for untouchables. It was a word used by the great saint

Narasinha Mehta, who, by the by, belonged to the Nagar Brahman community and who defied the whole community by claiming the untouchables as his own. I am delighted to adopt that word which is sanctified by having been used by such a great saint, but it has for me a deeper meaning than you may imagine. The untouchable to me is, compared to us, really a Harijana—a man of God, and we are “Durjana” (men of evil). For whilst the untouchable has toiled and moiled and dirtied his hands so that we may live in comfort and cleanliness, we have delighted in suppressing him. We are solely responsible for all the shortcomings and faults that we lay at the door of these untouchables. It is still open to us to be Harijana ourselves, but we can only do so by heartily repenting of our sin against them.”—*Young India*, August 6, 1931.

कुतस्तेषां देवायतनप्रवेशादिष्वनधिकारः ॥ १९ ॥

19. How then are they not entitled to enter temples ?

“I claim that Harijans have precisely the same common rights of worship, of use of public institutions and all other walks of life that the tallest of Hindus enjoy in common with the rest of Hindu mankind. And therefore I have not the shadow of a doubt that caste Hindus will not have performed their elementary duties by Harijans, until they have thrown open the gates of Guruvayur and such ancient temples to the Harijans precisely on the same terms on which they are open to other Hindus.”—*Harijan*, January 26, 1934.

“If all of you will say that you have done your duty by declaring that untouchability is a blot on Hinduism,

it will be a mockery. It will not be enough even if you, in a flush of enthusiasm, go to a Harijan and touch him and embrace him, and then forget all about him. It will not do even if you go to the Harijan quarters every day and make it a point to touch a number of Harijans as a token of your conviction.

What is required of you is that you should regulate your day to day conduct in such a manner that you make it absolutely evident to the Harijans whom you come across that a better day has dawned for them all.

You will begin by taking the Harijans along with you to the temple, if you are in the habit of going to a temple. But if you discover that you will not be allowed into the temple along with your Harijan companions, then if you have the living belief that I have that untouchability is wrong, you will shun that as you shun a scorpion or fire. You will then believe with me that such a temple is not inhabited by God. I will take by way of illustration the greatest temple known all over the world, viz., Kashi Viswanath in Benares. The Lord who is supposed to reside there is known as the Lord of the Universe. And yet in the very name of that Vishwanath, the Savarna Hindus have today the impudence to say to the Harijans : 'You shall not come to this temple.'

• I claim to be as good a Hindu as any orthodox Hindu. I have endeavoured to enforce all precepts of Hinduism in my own life to the best of my ability. I admit that my ability is small. But that does not affect my attitude to and love for Hinduism. Yet, in spite of all that love for Hinduism, with a due sense of my own responsibility,

I am here to tell you that so long as the doors of the Benares temple are closed against a single Harijan, Kashi Vishwanath does not reside in that temple and I could not possibly approach that temple with a belief in its sanctity, or in the faith that by worshipping there I should be purified of my sins. I can have no sense of piety in respect of such a temple. And what is true of Kashi Vishwanath is true of every other temple in India which bars its doors to Harijans. It applies, of course, to all such temples in South India, including the Guruvayur temple.

There is another aspect of the opening of temples to Harijans which you must not fail to realise. If you open your temples to Harijans because they demand that they shall be so opened, you will not be doing any great thing. But if you open the temples to them because of a sense of sin for which you should atone, it becomes a religious act. I should insist on Hindu temples being thrown open to Harijans even if the Harijans in India were converted to another religion and there was only one Harijan left in the Hindu fold. It is this religious attitude that isolates the Harijan question from all other questions and gives it a special importance. If our present programme was merely one of policy or political expediency, it would not have the religious significance that it has for me. If it was demonstrated to me to my satisfaction that the political or economic regeneration of Harijans would be enough to retain the Harijans in the Hindu fold, I should still want to open the temples and remove every trace of inequality. Because for me it is, as it must be for you, a question of repentance and reparation for the wrong we have done to our fellowmen.

I become impatient when Savarna Hindus tell me from their platform of high superiority that they will remove untouchability when Harijans give up their habits of drinking, eating carrion, uncleanness, etc. Suppose my father, mother, son or daughter were lepers, can I say that I will touch him or her only when he or she had got rid of leprosy? I will be false to our sacred tie if I do not serve him or her in his or her need. The position regarding Harijans is infinitely worse, because we ourselves are responsible for the condition to which Harijans have been reduced. For their drinking, eating carrion and other unclean habits we are directly responsible. Therefore, if we are true, we have to embrace them in spite of their shortcomings, and I hope, not without foundation, that immediately you adopt an attitude of mind looking upon the Harijans as your brothers they will change their habits. People who had experience in this direction will confirm this statement. It is therefore first necessary that Savarna Hindus should purify their hearts and change their attitude towards Harijans.”
—*Harijan*, June 20, 1936.

वर्णाश्रमधर्मविभागेष्वपि नोत्कर्षार्पकर्मभेदः ॥ २० ॥

20. Even in the division of duties according to Varnashrama, there is no implication of superiority and inferiority.

“What is this Varnashrama? It is not a system of water-tight compartments. It is a recognition to me of a scientific fact, whether we know it or not”.—*Young India*, July 17, 1924.

"It is a universal law stated in so many words by Hinduism. It is a law of spiritual economics. Nations of the West and Islam itself unwittingly are obliged to follow that law. It has nothing to do with superiority or inferiority. The customs about eating, drinking and marriage are no integral part of Varnashrama Dharma. It was a law discovered by your ancestors and my ancestors, the Rishis who saw that, if they were to give the best part of their lives to God and to the world and not to themselves, they must recognise that it is the law of heredity. It is a law designed to set free man's energy for higher pursuits in life."—*Young India*, September 22, 1927.

"So far as I know anything at all of Hinduism, the meaning of Varna is incredibly simple. It simply means the following on the part of us all the hereditary and traditional calling of our forefathers, in so far as that traditional calling is not inconsistent with fundamental ethics, and this only for the purpose of earning one's livelihood. I regard this as the law of our being, if we would accept the definition of man given in all religions. Of all the animal creation of God, man is the only animal who has been created in order that he may know his Maker. Man's aim in life is not therefore to add from day to day to his material prospects and to his material possessions, but his predominant calling is from day to day to come nearer his own Maker, and from this definition it was that the Rishis of old discovered this law of our being. You will realise that, if all of us follow this law of Varna, we would limit our material ambition, and our energy would be set free for exploring those vast fields whereby and wherethrough we can know God. You

will at once then see that nine-tenths of the activities that are today going on throughout the world and which are engrossing our attention would fall into disuse. You will then be entitled to say that Varna, as we observe it today, is a travesty of the Varna that I have described to you. And so it undoubtedly is, but just as we do not hate truth because untruth parades itself as truth, but we sift untruth from truth and cling to the latter, so also we can destroy the distortion that passes as Varna and purify the state to which the Hindu society has been reduced today.

“Ashrama is a necessary corollary to what I have stated to you, and if Varna today has become distorted, Ashrama has altogether disappeared. Ashrama means the four stages in one's life. The Brahmacharya Ashrama enjoins that only those who live the life of a Brahmachari, at least up to twenty-five years, are entitled to enter upon the second Ashrama, i.e., Grihasthashrama. And because the whole conception of Hinduism is to make man better than he is and draw him nearer to his Maker, the Rishis set a limit even to the Grihasthashrama stage and imposed on us the obligation of Vanaprastha and Sanyasa. But today you will vainly search throughout the length and breadth of India for a true Brahmachari, for a true Grihastha, not to talk of a Vanaprastha and a Sanyasi. We may, in our elongated wisdom, laugh at this scheme of life, if we wish to. But I have no doubt whatsoever that this is the secret of the great success of Hinduism. The Hindu civilization has survived the Egyptian, the Assyrian and the Babylonian. The Christian is but two thousand years old. The Islamic is but of yesterday. Great as both these are, they are still in my humble opinion in the making.”—*Young India*, October 20, 1927.

“ I refuse, therefore, to believe that Varnashrama has been the curse of Hinduism as it is the fashion nowadays in the south on the part of some Hindus to say. But that does not mean that you and I may tolerate for one moment or be gentle towards the hideous travesty of Varnashrama that we see about us today. There is nothing in common between Varnashrama and caste. Caste, if you will, is undoubtedly a drag upon Hindu progress, and untouchability is, as I have already called it or described it, an excrescence upon Varnashrama. It is a weedy growth fit only to be weeded out as we weed out the weeds that we see growing in wheat fields or rice fields. In this conception of Varna, there is absolutely no idea of superiority and inferiority. If I again interpret the Hindu spirit rightly, all life is absolutely equal and one. It is therefore an arrogant assumption on the part of the Brahman when he says, “ I am superior to the other three Varnas.” That is not what the Brahmins of old said. They commanded homage not because they claimed superiority, but because they claimed the right of service through and through without the slightest expectation of a reward. The priests, who to-day arrogate to themselves the function of the Brahman and distort religion, are no custodians of Hinduism or Brahmanism. Consciously or unconsciously they are laying the axe at the root of the very tree on which they are sitting and when they tell you that Shastras enjoin untouchability and when they talk of pollution distance, I have no hesitation in saying that they are belying their creed and that they are misunderstanding the spirit of Hinduism. True Ahimsa should mean a complete

freedom from ill-will, anger, and hate and an overflowing love for all.”—*Young India*, September 20, 1928.

प्रेमैव परं रूपमहिंसायाः ॥ २१ ॥

21. Love is indeed the highest form of non-violence.

“Ahimsa is not mere non-killing. A person who remains smugly satisfied with the non-killing of noxious life but has no love in his heart for all that lives will be counted as least in the Kingdom of Heaven. True love is boundless like the ocean, and rising and swelling within one spreads itself out and crossing all boundaries and frontiers envelops the whole world.”—*Young India*, September 20, 1928.

“But the trouble with our votaries of Ahimsa is that they have made of Ahimsa a blind fetish and put the greatest obstacle in the way of the spread of true Ahimsa in our midst. The current (and in my opinion, mistaken) view of Ahimsa has drugged our conscience and rendered us insensible to a host of other and more insidious forms of Himsa like harsh words, harsh judgments, ill-will, anger and spite and lust of cruelty, it has made us forget that there may be far more Himsa in the slow torture of men and animals, the starvation and exploitation to which they are subjected out of selfish greed, the wanton humiliation and oppression of the weak and the killing of their self-respect that we witness all around us to-day than in mere benevolent taking of life.”—*Young India*, October 4, 1928.

“I cannot undertake, and least of all through a newspaper article written during moments snatched from the

daily routine, to prove that love is the source and end of life. But I venture to make some relevant suggestions which may pave the way for an understanding of the law. All the Teachers that ever lived have preached that law with more or less vigour. If Love was not the law of life, life would not have persisted in the midst of death. Life is a perpetual triumph over the grave. If there is a fundamental distinction between man and beast, it is the former's progressive recognition of the law and its application in practice to his own personal life. All the saints of the world, ancient and modern, were each, according to his light and capacity, a living illustration of that supreme law of our being. That the brute in us seems so often to gain an easy triumph is true enough. That, however, does not disprove the law. It shows the difficulty of practice. How should it be otherwise with a law which is as high as Truth itself? When the practice of the law becomes universal, God will reign on earth as He does in heaven. I need not be reminded that earth and heaven are in us. We know the earth, we are strangers to the heaven within us. If it is allowed that for some the practice of love is possible, it is arrogance not to allow even the possibility of its practice to all the others. Not very remote ancestors of ours indulged in cannibalism and many other practices which we would today call loathsome. No doubt in those days too there were Dick Sheppards who must have been laughed at and possibly pilloried for preaching the (to them) strange doctrine of refusing to eat fellowmen. Modern science is replete with illustrations of the seemingly impossible having become possible within

living memory. But the victories of physical science would be nothing against the victory of the science of Life which is summed up in Love which is the law of our being. I know that it cannot be proved by argument. It shall be proved by persons living it in their lives in utter disregard of consequences to themselves. There is no real gain without sacrifice. And since the demonstration of the Law of Love is the realest gain, sacrifice too must be the greatest required.”—*Harijan*, September 26, 1936.

तदेव मूलं गृहधर्माणाम् ॥ २२ ॥

22. It is the basis of all domestic duties.

“Do we not spend a fortune to reform members of our own families. Are the untouchables not members of the great Hindu family”?—*Young India*, May 13, 1926.

प्रपञ्चः खलु कुटुम्बमीशस्य ॥ २३ ॥

23. The world is indeed the family of God.

“Indeed, Hinduism teaches us to regard the whole of humanity as one indivisible and undivided family and holds each one of us responsible for the misdeeds of all.”—*Young India*, May 13, 1926.

• अतो गृहधमेव प्रपञ्चधर्मः ॥ २४ ॥

24. Therefore the law of the family should be the law of the world.

“And what is true of families and communities is true of nations. There is no reason to believe that there

is one law for families, and another for nations.”—*Hind Swaraj*, Page 69.

“Nations cohere because there is mutual regard among the individuals composing them. Some day we must extend the nation law to the universe, even as we have extended the family law to form nations—a larger family. God has ordained that India should be such a nation.”—*Young India*, March 2, 1922.

प्रेमैव मेघजं द्वेषस्य ॥ २५ ॥

25. Love is the only remedy for hate.

“Causes of hatred everywhere obtrude themselves on one’s gaze. The seers of old saw that the only way of dealing with the situation was to neutralize hatred by love.”—*Young India*, September 29, 1927.

“Hatred ever kills, love never dies. Such is the vast difference between the two. What is obtained by love is retained for all time. What is obtained by hatred proves a burden in reality, for it increases hatred. The duty of a human being is to diminish hatred and to promote love.”—*Young India*, May 10, 1919.

तस्य विलासो निर्भयस्यैव हृदये ॥ २६ ॥

26. It blossoms only in the heart of a fearless man.

“Ahimsa is the religion of a Kshatriya. Mahavira was a Kshatriya, Buddha was a Kshatriya, Rama and Krishna were Kshatriyas and all of them were votaries of Ahimsa. We want to propagate Ahimsa in their name. But today Ahimsa has become the monopoly of timid Vaishyas and

that is why it has been bēsmirched. Ahimsa is the extreme limit of forgiveness. But forgiveness is the quality of the brave. Ahimsa is, impossible without fearlessness."—*Young India*, October 21, 1926.

"Strength lies in absence of fear, not in the quantity of flesh and muscle we may have on our bodies."—*Hind Swaraj*, page 29.

हिंसापि क्लैव्याच्छेयसी ॥ २७ ॥

27. Even violence is better than cowardice.

"I do believe that where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence. Hence it was I took part in the Boer War, the so-called Zulu rebellion and the late war. Hence also do I advocate training in arms for those who believe in the method of violence. I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour."—*Young India*, August 11, 1920.

"My creed of non-violence is an extremely active force. It has no room for cowardice or even weakness. There is hope for a violent man to be some day non-violent, but there is none for a coward. I have therefore said more than once in these pages that if we do not know how to defend ourselves, our women and our places of worship by the force of suffering, i.e., non-violence, we must, if we are men, be at least able to defend all these by fighting."—*Young India*, June 16, 1927.

"The very first step in non-violence is that we cultivate in our daily life, as between ourselves, truthful-

ness, humility, tolerance, loving-kindness. Honesty, they say in English, is the best policy. But in terms of non-violence it is not mere 'policy'. Policies may and do change. Non-violence is an unchangeable creed. It has to be pursued in face of violence raging around you. Non-violence with a non-violent man is no merit. In fact it becomes difficult to say whether it is non-violence at all. But when it is pitted against violence, then one realizes the difference between the two. This we cannot do unless we are very wakeful, ever vigilant, ever striving."—*Harijan*, April 2, 1938.

"I therefore ask you and myself whether our non-violence is of the weak instead of the strong, as it should be. That it can work to a certain extent in the hands of the weak is true. It has so worked with us. But when it becomes a cloak for our weakness, it emasculates us. Far better than emasculation would be the bravery of those who use physical force. Far better than cowardice would be meeting one's death fighting. We were perhaps all originally brutes, and I am prepared to believe that we have become men by a slow process of evolution from the brute. We were thus born with brute strength, but we were born men in order to realise God who dwells in us. That indeed is the privilege of man and it distinguishes him from the brute creation. But to realize God is to see Him in all that lives, i.e., to realize our oneness with all creation. This is impossible unless we voluntarily shun physical force and develop conscious non-violence that is latent in every one of us. This can only come out of strength. Have we the non-violence of the strong? It is open to us to discard it as an impossible

ideal and choose instead the method of violence. But the choice has to be made.”—*Harijan*, April 2, 1938.

“If the method of violence takes plenty of training the method of non-violence takes even more training, and the training is much more difficult than the training for violence. The first essential of that training is a living faith in God. He who has a living faith in God will not do evil deeds with the name of God on his lips. He will not rely on the sword but will rely solely on God. But you may say that a coward may also pass off as a believer in God saying he does not use the sword. Cowardice is no sign of belief in God. The true man of God has the strength to use the sword, but will not use it knowing that every man is the image of God.”—*Harijan*, May 14, 1938.

अहिंसा तु श्रेष्ठा ॥ २८ ॥

28. But non-violence is best.

“But I believe that non-violence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment. Forgiveness adorns a soldier. But abstinence is forgiveness, only when there is power to punish; it is meaningless when it pretends to proceed from a helpless creature. A mouse hardly forgives a cat when it allows itself to be torn to pieces by her.”—*Young India*, August 11, 1920.

“I contemplate a mental and therefore a moral opposition to immoralities. I seek entirely to blunt the edge of the tyrant’s sword not by putting up against it a sharper-edged weapon, but by disappointing his expectation that I would be offering physical resistance. The

resistance of the soul that I should offer instead would elude him. It would at first dazzle him and at last compel recognition from him, which recognition would not humiliate him but would uplift him.”—*Young India*, October 8, 1925.

“It has been my belief and practice for over forty years deliberately to practise the doctrine of non-resistance to evil, not to retaliate.” There are more instances than one in my public life when, with the ability to retaliate, I have refrained from doing so and advised friends to do likewise. My life is dedicated to the spread of that doctrine. I read it in the teaching of all the greatest teachers of the world—Zoraster, Mahavir, Daniel, Jesus, Mahomed, Nanak and a host of others. Indeed I am not sure that we do justice to Moses when we impute to him the doctrine of retaliation in the sense that he made it obligatory on his followers to exact an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. It may be my wish that is father to the thought. But I do think that in an age when people were unrestrained in their appetite for the enemy’s blood, Moses restricted retaliation to equal measure and no more.”—*Young India*, February 9, 1922.

“It may not therefore be presumptuous on my part, if I set down without argument the implications and conditions of success of non-violence. Here they are :—

(1) Non-violence is the law of the human race and is infinitely greater than and superior to brute force.

(2) In the last resort it does not avail those who do not possess a living faith in the God of Love.

(3) Non-violence affords the fullest protection to one's self respect and sense of honour, but not always to possession of land or movable property, though its habitual practice does prove a better bulwark than the possession of armed men to defend them. Non-violence in the very nature of things is of no assistance in the defence of ill-gotten gains and immoral acts.

(4) Individuals or nations who would practise non-violence must be prepared to sacrifice (nations to the last man) their all except honour. It is therefore inconsistent with the possession of other people's countries, i.e., modern imperialism which is frankly based on force for its defence.

(5) Non-violence is a power which can be wielded equally by all—children, young men and women or grown up people—provided they have a living faith in the God of Love and have therefore equal love for all mankind. When non-violence is accepted as the law of life it must pervade the whole being and not be applied to isolated acts.

(6) It is a profound error to suppose that whilst the law is good enough for individuals it is not for masses of mankind."—*Harijan*, September 5, 1936.

"Non-violence cannot be preached. It has to be practised. The practice of violence can be taught to people by outward symbols. You shoot at boards, then at targets, then at beasts. Then you are passed as an expert in the art of destruction. The non-violent man has no outward weapon, and therefore not only his speech but his action also seems ineffective. I may say all kinds of sweet words to you without meaning them. On the

other hand I may have real love in me and yet my outward expression may be forbidding. Then outwardly my action in both cases may be the same and yet the effect may be different. For the effect of our action is often more potent when it is not patently known. Thus the unconscious effect you are making on me I may never know. It is, nevertheless, infinitely greater than the conscious effect. In violence there is nothing invisible. Non-violence on the other hand is three fourths invisible and so the effect is in the inverse ratio to its invisibility. Non-violence, when it becomes active, travels with extraordinary velocity and then it becomes a miracle. So the mass mind is affected first unconsciously, then consciously. When it becomes consciously affected there is demonstrable victory. In my own experience when people seemed to be weakening there was no consciousness of defeat in me.”—*Harijan*, March 20, 1937.

अहिंसा नित्यो धर्मः, हिंसा तु नैमित्तिक एव ॥ २९ ॥

29. Non-violence is the eternal law, violence is only the law of expediency.

“I make bold to say that violence is the creed of no religion and that whereas non-violence in most cases is obligatory in all, violence is merely permissible in some cases.”—*Young India*, March 2, 1922.

“Life is an aspiration. Its mission is to strive after perfection, which is self-realisation. The ideal must not be lowered because of our weaknesses or imperfections. I am painfully conscious of both in me. The silent cry daily goes out to Truth to help me to remove these weak-

nesses and imperfections of mine. I own my fear of snakes, scorpions, lions, tigers, plague-stricken rats, and fleas, even as I must own fear of evil-looking robbers and murderers. I know that I ought not to fear any of them. But this is no intellectual feat. It is a feat of the heart. It needs more than a heart of oak to shed all fear except the fear of God. I could not in my weakness ask the people of Borsad not to kill deadly rats and fleas. But I knew that it was a concession to human weakness.

Nevertheless there is that difference between a belief in ahimsa and a belief in himsa which there is between north and south, life and death. One who hooks his fortunes to ahimsa, the law of love, daily lessens the circle of destruction and to that extent promotes life and love; he who swears by himsa, the law of hate, daily widens the circle of destruction and to that extent promotes death and hate. Though, before the people of Borsad, I endorsed the destruction of rats and fleas, my own kith and kin, I preached to them without adulteration the grand doctrine of the eternal law of love of all life. Though I may fail to carry it out to the full in this life, my faith in it shall abide. Every failure brings me nearer the realization."—*Harijan*, June 22, 1935.

धीरस्वात्यैवाचरत्यहिंसाम् ॥ ३० ॥

30. By his own suffering does a brave man observe
• non-violence.

"I would like to see the Snataks of this Vidyapith in the front in any campaign for Swaraj. I want you to visualise what is coming. You have a harder ordeal than going to jail. Robbers, dacoits and murderers also can go to jail and they make themselves thoroughly at home

there. But they do not serve the country by going to jail. A mere jail-going man does not help the country. What I want from you is 'the preparedness to offer yourselves willing and pure sacrifices in the struggle. There is a lot of violence in the air, and you will have to immolate yourselves in the flames, if there are violent outbursts when and if I am put into jail. If you are true to your pledge of truth and non-violence you will not hide yourselves in your houses whilst violence or incendiarism is going on, nor will you be active participators in it, but you will go and rush into the conflagration with a view to extinguishing. For surely that will be expected of you. Even the votaries of violence will expect that and nothing else from you.'—*Young India*, January 16, 1930.

यावद्दुःखं सहते तावदुपकरोति ॥ ३१ ॥

31. The more one suffers, the more one helps.

“The English and French histories are replete with instances of men continuing their pursuit of the right, irrespective of the amount of suffering involved. The actors did not stop to think whether ignorant people would not have involuntarily to suffer. Why should we expect to write our history differently? It is possible for us, if we would, to learn from the mistakes of our predecessors to do better, but it is impossible to do away with the law of suffering which is the one indispensable condition of our being. The way to do better is to avoid, if we can, violence from our side and thus quicken the rate of progress and to introduce greater purity in the methods of suffering. Progress is to be measured by the amount of suffering undergone by the sufferer.

यावद्विशुद्धं सहनं तावत्येव सिद्धिः ॥ ३२ ॥

32. The purer the suffering, the greater is the gain.

"The purer the suffering, the greater is the progress. Hence did the sacrifice of Jesus suffice to free a sorrowing world. In his onward march, he did not count the cost of suffering, entailed upon his neighbours, whether it was undergone by them voluntarily or otherwise. Thus did the sufferings of a Harischandra suffice to re-establish the kingdom of Truth. He must have known that his subjects would suffer involuntarily by his abdication. He did not mind because he could not do otherwise than follow Truth."—*Young India*, June 16, 1920.

"In a reform the Satyagrahi seeks to convert his opponent by sheer force of character and suffering. The purer he is and the more he suffers, the quicker the progress. He must therefore resign himself to being excommunicated, debarred from the family privileges and deprived of his share in the family property. He must not only bear such hardships cheerfully but he must actively love his persecutors. The latter honestly believe that the reformer is doing something sinful and therefore resort to the only means they know to be effective to wean him from his supposed error. The Satyagrahi on the other hand does not seek to carry out his reform by a system of punishments, but by penance, self-purification and suffering. Any resentment of the persecution, therefore, would be an interruption of the course of discipline he has imposed upon himself. It may be a prolonged course, it may even seem to be never ending."—*Young India*, September 18, 1924.

न हि सिद्धिस्त्यागेनाप्यसंयतस्य ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Futile is renunciation without self-control.

“There is no deliverance and no hope without sacrifice, discipline and self-control. Mere sacrifice without discipline will be unavailing.”—*Young India*, October 20, 1920.

“Undisciplined agitation which is a paraphrase of violence of speech or deed can only retard national growth and bring about even unmerited retribution. Disciplined agitation is the condition of national growth.”—*Young India*, May 26, 1920.

“Our popular demonstrations are unquestionably mob-demonstrations. I have been ashamed to witness, at railway stations, thoughtless, though unwitting, destruction of passengers’ luggage by demonstrators who, in their adoration of their heroes, have ignored everything else and everybody else. They have made, much to the discomfort of their heroes, unmusical and harsh noises. They have trampled upon one another. They have elbowed out one another. All have shouted, all at the same time, in the holy name of order and peace. Ten volunteers have been heard to give the same order at the same time. Volunteers often become demonstrators instead of remaining people’s policemen. It is a task often dangerous, always uncomfortable, for the heroes to be escorted through a broken chain of volunteers from the platform to the coach intended for them. Often it is a process which, although it should occupy no more than five minutes, has occupied one hour. The crowd, instead of pressing back, presses towards the heroes, who therefore require to be protected. The

coach is taken possession of by anybody who dares, volunteers being the greatest sinners. The heroes and other lawful occupants have to reason with the intruders that they may not mount the footboards in that summary fashion. The hood of the coach is roughly handled by the processionists. It is not often that I have seen hoods of motors left undamaged by crowds. On the route instead of crowds lining the streets, they follow the coach. The result is confusion worse confounded. Every moment there is danger of accidents. That there is rarely any accident at such demonstrations is not due to the skill of the organisers, but the crowd is determined to put up with all jostling and retain its perfect good humour. In spite of everyone jostling everyone else, one has not the slightest wish to inconvenience one's neighbour. To finish the picture, there is the meeting, an ever-growing cause of anxiety. You face nothing but disorder, din, pressing, yelling and shouting there. A good speaker arrests the attention of the audience and there is order such that you can hear a pin drop.

All the same this is mobocracy. You are at the mercy of the mob. So long as there is sympathy between you and the mob, everything goes well. Immediately that cord is broken, there is horror."—*Young India*, September 8, 1920.

परोपकार एव यज्ञः, एष वोऽस्त्विष्टकामधुक् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. Service to others is true sacrifice—"May it be your cow of plenty"!

"*Yajna* means an act directed to the welfare of others done without receiving or desiring a return for it, whether of a temporal or spiritual nature. "Act" here must be

taken in its widest sense and includes thought and word, as well as deed. 'Others' embraces not only humanity, but all life. Therefore, and also from the standpoint of Ahimsa, it will not be Yajna to sacrifice lower animals even with a view to the service of humanity.

"Again a primary sacrifice must be an act, which conduces the most to the welfare of the greatest number in the widest area and which can be performed by the largest number of men and women with the least trouble. It will not therefore, be a "Yajna" much less a "Mahayajna" to wish or to do ill to any one else, even to serve a so-called higher interest. And the Gita teaches, and experience testifies, that all action that cannot come under the category of "Yajna" promotes bondage.

"The world cannot subsist for a single moment without "Yajna" in this sense, and therefore the Gita, after having dealt with true wisdom in the second chapter, takes up in the third the means of attaining it, and declares in so many words, that "Yajna" came with the creation itself. This body therefore has been given us, only in order that we may serve all creation with it. And therefore, says the Gita, he who eats without offering "Yajna" eats stolen food. Every single act of one who would lead a life of purity, should be in the nature of "Yajna." "Yajna" having come to us with our birth, we are debtors all our lives and thus for ever bound to serve the universe. And even as a bondsman receives food, clothing and so on from the master whom he serves so should we gratefully accept such gifts as may be assigned to us by the Lord of the universe.

"Again, not only the good, but all of us are bound to place our resources at the disposal of humanity. And

if such is the law, as evidently it is, indulgence ceases to hold a place in life and gives way to renunciation. The duty of renunciation differentiates mankind from the beast.

Some object that life thus understood becomes dull and devoid of art, and leaves no room for the householder. But renunciation here does not mean abandoning the world and retiring into the forest. The spirit of renunciation should rule all the activities of life.

“Again, many sacrificers imagine that they are free to receive from the people everything they need, and many things they do not need, because they are rendering disinterested service. Directly this idea sways a man, he ceases to be a servant, and becomes a tyrant over the people.

One who would serve will not waste a thought upon his own comforts, which he leaves to be attended to or neglected by his Master on high. He will not therefore encumber himself with everything that comes his way ; he will take only what he strictly needs and leave the rest. He will be calm, free from anger and unruffled in mind even if he finds himself inconvenienced. His service, like virtue, is its own reward and he will rest content with it.

“Again, one dare not be negligent in service, or be behind-hand with it. He who thinks that one must be diligent only in one's personal business, and unpaid public business may be done in any way and at any time one chooses, has still to learn the very rudiments of the science of sacrifice. Voluntary service of others demands

the best of which one is capable and must take precedence over service of self. In fact, the pure devotee consecrates himself to the service of humanity without any reservation whatever."—*From Yeravda Mandir, Pages 77-87.*

अयज्ञस्सन् यो भुङ्क्ते स्तेन एव सः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. He who eats without performing this sacrifice is a thief.

"You know that the Gita says that he who eats without offering the daily sacrifice steals his food. To beg one's food is a good thing, but only after one has offered one's sacrifice.—*Harijan, April 20, 1935.*

"Sacrifices may be of many kinds. One of them may well be bread-labour. If all laboured for their bread and no more, then there would be enough food and enough leisure for all. Then there would be no cry of over-population, no disease, and no such misery as we see around. Such labour will be the highest form of sacrifice. Men will no doubt do many other things either through their bodies or through their minds, but all this will be labour of love, for the common good. There will then be no rich and no poor, none high, none low, no touchable and no untouchable.

This may be an unattainable ideal. But we need not therefore, cease to strive for it. Even if without fulfilling the whole law of sacrifice, that is, the law of our being, we performed physical labour enough for our daily bread, we should go a long way towards the ideal.

If we did so, our wants would be minimized, our food would be simple. We should then eat to live, not

live to eat. Let anyone who doubts the accuracy of this proposition try to sweat for his bread, he will derive the greatest relish from the productions of his labour, improve his health and discover that many things he took were superfluities.”—*Harijan*, June 29, 1935.

“I do feel that, whilst it is bad to encourage begging, I will not send away a beggar without offering him work and food. If he will not work, I should let him go without food. Those who are physically disabled like the halt and the maimed and the blind have got to be supported by the State.”—*Harijan*, May 11, 1935.

स्वस्वरूपाच्च्युतएव नरो जायते, च्युतस्ततोऽप्युद्ब्रह्ते ॥ ३६ ॥

36. Falling from his original state man takes birth, and falling still further he marries.

“Hinduism does not regard a married state as by any means essential for salvation. Marriage is a ‘fall’ even as birth is a ‘fall.’ Salvation is freedom from birth and hence death also.”—*Young India*, October 6, 1921.

“The aim of human life is Moksha. As a Hindu believe that Moksha is freedom from birth by breaking the bonds of the flesh, by becoming one with God. Now marriage is a hindrance in the attainment of this supreme object, in as much as it only tightens the bonds of flesh. Celibacy is a great help in as much as it enables one to lead a life full of surrender to God.”—*Young India*, November 20, 1924.

ब्रह्मचर्येणैव तस्य मोक्षः ॥ ३७ ॥

37. His salvation is only through chastity.

"I hold that a life of perfect continence in thought, speech and action is necessary for reaching spiritual perfection."—*Young India*, October 13, 1936.

"Brahmacharya means perfect control over all the senses and organs. For the perfect Brahmachari nothing is impossible. But it is an ideal state which is rarely realised."—*Young India*, October 13, 1936.

"Brahmacharya is to be observed in thought, word and deed. This applies to all observances. We are told in the Gita, and our experience corroborates the statement, that the foolish man, who appears to control his body, but is nursing evil thoughts in his mind, makes a vain effort. It is harmful to suppress the body if the mind is at the same time allowed to go astray. Where the mind wanders, the body must follow sooner or later. It is necessary here to appreciate one distinction. It is one thing to allow the mind to harbour impure thoughts, it is a different thing altogether if it strays among them in spite of ourselves. Victory will be ours in the end, if we non-co-operate with the mind in this evil process. We experience, every moment of our life, that often, while the body is subject to our control, the mind is not. Hence the body must be immediately taken in hand, and then we must put forth a constant endeavour to bring the mind under control. We can do nothing more, nothing less. If we give way to the mind, the body and the mind will pull different ways and we shall be false to ourselves. Body and mind may be said to go together so long as we continue to resist the approach of every evil thought.

The observance of Brahmacharya has been believed to be very difficult, almost impossible. Trying to find a

reason for this belief, we see that the term *Brahmacharya* has been understood in a narrow sense. Mere control of animal passion has been thought to be tantamount to observing *Brahmacharya*. I feel that this conception is incomplete and wrong. *Brahmacharya* means control of all the organs of sense. He who attempts to control only one organ and allows all the others free play is bound to find his effort futile. To hear suggestive stories with the ears, to see suggestive sights with the eyes, to taste stimulating food with the tongue, to touch exciting things with the hands, and then at the same time to try to control the only remaining organ is like putting one's hand in a fire, and then trying to escape burns. He therefore who is resolved to control the one must be likewise determined to control the rest. I have always felt that much harm has been done by the narrow definition of *Brahmacharya*. If we practise simultaneous self-control in all directions, the attempt is scientific and easy of success. Perhaps the palate is the chief sinner. Hence we have assigned to its control a separate place among the observances.

Let us remember the root meaning of *Brahmacharya*. *Brahmacharya* means *charya* or course of conduct adapted to the search of Brahman, i.e., Truth. From this etymological meaning arises the special meaning, viz., control of all the senses. We must completely forget the incomplete definition which restricts itself to the sexual aspect only."—*From Yeravda Mandir*, Page 19.

"*Brahmacharya* does not mean mere physical self-control. It means much more. It means complete control over all the senses. Thus an impure thought is a breach of *brahmacharya*, so is anger. All power comes

from the preservation and sublimation of the vitality that is responsible for creation of life. If the vitality is husbanded instead of being dissipated, it is transmuted into creative energy of the highest order. This vitality is continuously and even unconsciously dissipated by evil, or even rambling disorderly, unwanted thoughts. And since thought is the root of all speech and action, the quality of the latter corresponds to that of the former. Hence perfectly controlled thought is itself power of the highest potency and can become self-acting. That seems to me to be the meaning of the silent prayer of the heart. If man is after the image of God, he has but to will a thing in the limited sphere allotted to him and it becomes. Such power is impossible in one who dissipates his energy in any way whatsoever, even as steam kept in a leaky pipe yields no power. The sexual act divorced from the deliberate purpose of generation is a typical and gross form of dissipation and has therefore been specially and rightly chosen for condemnation. But in one who has to organise vast masses of mankind for non-violent action the full control described by me has to be attempted and virtually achieved.

This control is unattainable save by the grace of God. There is a verse in the second chapter of the Gita which freely rendered means: "Sense-effects remain in abeyance whilst one is fasting or whilst the particular sense is starved, but the hankering does not cease except when one sees God face to face." This control is not mechanical or temporary. Once attained it is never lost. In that state vital energy is stored up without any chance of escaping by the innumerable outlets.

It has been said that *brahmacharya*, if it is at all attainable, can be so only by cave-dwellers. A *brahma-*

chari, it is said, should never see, much less touch, a woman. Doubtless a *brahmachari* may not think of, speak of, see or touch a woman *lustfully*. But the prohibition one finds in books on *brahmacharya* is mentioned without the important adverb. The reason for the omission seems to be that man is no impartial judge in such matters, and therefore cannot say when he is or is not affected by such contacts. Cupid's visitations are often unperceivable. Difficult though therefore *brahmacharya* is of observance when one freely mixes with the world, it is not of much value if it is attainable only by retirement from the world."—*Harijan*, July 23, 1938.

"Absolute renunciation, absolute *brahmacharya* is the ideal state. If you dare not think of it, marry by all means, but even then live a life of self-control.—*Harijan*, September 7, 1935.

उद्वाहोऽपि प्रजायै न तु कामोपभोगाय ॥ ३८ ॥

38. Marriage is for progeny and not for sensual enjoyment.

"No, I must declare with all the power I can command that sensual attraction even between husband and wife is unnatural. Marriage is meant to cleanse the hearts of the couple of sordid passions and take them nearer to God. Lustless love between husband and wife is not impossible. Man is not a brute. He has risen to a higher state after countless births in brute creation. He is born to stand, not to walk on all fours or crawl. Bestiality is as far removed from manhood, as matter from spirit."—*Young India*, April 29, 1926.

"I submit that marriage is a fence that protects religion. If the fence were to be destroyed religion would go to pieces. The foundation of religion is restraint and marriage is nothing but restraint. The man who knows no restraint has no hope of self-realisation. I confess it may be difficult to prove the necessity of restraint to an atheist or a materialist. But he who knows the perishable nature of the flesh from the imperishable nature of the spirit, instinctively knows that self-realisation is impossible without self-discipline and self-restraint. The body may either be a playground of passion or a temple of self-realisation. If it is the latter, there is no room there for libertinism. The spirit needs must curb the flesh every moment."—*Young India*, June 3, 1926.

"That the sole purpose of sexual connection is procreation is in the nature of a new discovery for me. I had never before given it the weight it deserved. I must have till recently regarded it as a mere pious wish. I now regard it as a fundamental law of married state which is easy of observance if its paramount importance is duly recognised. My object will be fulfilled when the law is given its due place in society. To me it is a living law. We break it always and pay heavily for its breach."—*Harijan*, April 25, 1936.

धनस्य सञ्चयो हि दुरितस्य सञ्चयः ॥ ३९ ॥

39. Accumulation of wealth is accumulation of sin.

"The art of amassing riches becomes a degrading and despicable art if it is not accompanied by the nobler art

of how to spend wealth usefully.”—*Young India*, October 6, 1927.

“God that provides the little ant its speck of food and the elephant his daily one maund of bolus will not neglect to provide man with his daily meal. Nature’s creatures do not worry or fret about tomorrow, but simply wait on tomorrow for the daily sustenance. Only man in his overweening pride and egotism imagines himself to be the lord and master of the earth and goes on piling up for himself goods that perish. Nature tries every day by its rude shocks to wean him from his pride, but he refuses to shed it. Satyagraha is a specific for bringing home to one the lesson of humility.”—*Young India*, May 21, 1931.

“Generally speaking, it is the experience of the world that possession of gold is inconsistent with the possession of virtue ; but though such is the unfortunate experience in the world, it is by no means an inexorable law. We have the celebrated instance of Janaka, who, although he was rolling in riches and had a limitless power, being a great prince, was still one of the purest men of his age. And even in our own age I can cite from my own personal experience and tell you that I have the good fortune of knowing several moneyed men who do not find it impossible to lead a straight and pure life.”—*Young India*, October 6, 1927.

सर्वदा सर्वत्र सेवितव्यो दरिद्रनारायणः ॥ ४० ॥

40. Always and everywhere worship God in the poor.

“I have always had a love for the poor all my life and in abundance. I could cite illustrations after illustrations

from my past life to show that it was something innate in me. I have never felt that there was any difference between the poor and me. I have always felt towards them as my own kith and kin.—*Harijan*, May 11, 1935.

“Khadi service, village service and Harijan service are all one in reality, though three in name. They are purely humanitarian services with no other aim than that of serving Daridranarayan. Harijans are the most down trodden among the millions of Daridranarayans. Their service necessarily includes that of all. A cup of water served to a Harijan in the name of God is a cup served to all the neglected ones of humanity.”—*Harijan*, June 22, 1935.

“You have three millions unemployed, but we have nearly three hundred million unemployed for half the year. Your average unemployment dole is seventy shillings. Our average income is seven shillings and six pence a month. That operative was right in saying that he was falling in his own estimation. I do believe it is a debasing thing for a human being to remain idle and to live on doles. Whilst conducting a strike I would not brook the strikers remaining idle for a single day and got them to break the stones or carry sand and work in public streets asking my own co-workers to join them in that work. Imagine, therefore, what a calamity it must be to have three hundred million unemployed, several millions becoming degraded everyday for want of employment, devoid of self-respect, devoid of faith in God. I dare not take before them the message of God. I may as well place before the dog over there the message of God as before those hungry millions

who have no lustre in their eyes and whose only God is their bread. I can take before them a message of God only by taking the message of sacred work before them. It is good enough to talk of God whilst we are sitting here after a nice breakfast and looking forward to a nicer luncheon, but how am I to talk of God to the millions who have to go without two meals a day. To them God can only appear as bread and butter. Well, the peasants of India were getting their bread from their soil. I have offered them the spinning wheel in order that they may get butter, and if I appear to day before the British public in my loin cloth it is because I have come as the sole representative of those half-starved, half-naked dumb millions. We have prayed that we may bask in the presence of God's sunshine. I tell you it is impossible to do so whilst millions are knocking at your door. Even in your misery you are comparatively happy. I do not grudge that happiness. I wish well to you, but do not think of prospering on the tombs of the poor millions of India. I do not want for India an isolated life at all, but I do not want to depend on any country for my food and clothing. Whilst we may devise means for tiding over the present crisis, I must tell you that you should cherish no hope of reviving the old Lancashire trade. It is impossible. I cannot religiously help in the process."—*Young India*, October 15, 1931.

माननीयाः खलु कृषीवलाः ॥ ४१ ॥

41. Honour the ploughman.

“Nine tenths of the world's population are engaged in agriculture. It blesses the earth and is therefore a

pure and necessary sacrifice. Any one, therefore, who is virtuously inclined may engage himself in this occupation renouncing all the unnecessary ones and thus earn merit for himself.”—*Young India*, May 21, 1925.

“Many a British official has written about the conditions of the people of India. No one has to my knowledge said that the Indian villager has enough to keep body and soul together. On the contrary they have admitted that the bulk of the population live on the verge of starvation and ten per cent are semi-starved, and that millions have to rest content with a pinch of dirty salt and chillies and polished rice or parched grain. You may be sure that, if any of us were to be asked to live on that diet, we should not expect to survive it longer than a month or should be afraid of losing our mental faculties. And yet our villagers go through that state from day to day.”—*Harijan*, April 4, 1936.

“The village work frightens us. We who are town-bred find it trying to take to the village life. Our bodies in many cases do not respond to the hard life. But it is a difficulty which we have to face boldly, even heroically, if our desire is to establish Swaraj for the people, not substitute one class rule by another, which may be even worse. Hitherto the villagers have died in their thousands so that we might live. Now we might have to die so that they may live. The difference will be fundamental. The former have died unknowingly and involuntarily. Their enforced sacrifice has degraded us. If now we die knowingly and willingly, our sacrifice will ennoble us and the whole nation. Let us not flinch from the necessary sacrifice, if we will live as an independent self-respecting nation.”—*Young India*, April 17, 1924.

अवस्करवाहाश्च ॥ ४२ ॥

42. And also the scavenger,

"I learnt scavenging for the first time in South Africa, and have ever been laying the greatest stress on the fact that it is work of this kind that qualifies one for Swaraj."
—*Harijan*, June 8, 1935.

"I love scavengering. In my Ashram an eighteen year old Brahmin lad is doing the scavenger's work in order to teach the Ashram scavenger cleanliness. The lad is no reformer. He was born and bred in orthodoxy. He is a regular reader of the Gita and faithfully performs Sandhyavandana. His pronounciation of Sanskrit verses is more faultless than mine. When he conducts the prayer his soft sweet melodies melt one into love. But he felt that his accomplishments were incomplete until he had become also a perfect sweeper, and that, if he wanted the Ashram sweeper to do his work well, he must do it himself and set an example."—*Young India*, April 27, 1921.

"The ideal Bhangi of my conception would be a Brahmin *par excellence*, possibly even excel him. It is possible to envisage the existence of a Bhangi without a Brahmin. But without the former the latter could not be. It is the Bhangi who enables society to live. A Bhangi does for society what a mother does for her baby. A mother washes her baby of the dirt and insures his health. Even so the Bhangi protects and safeguards the health of the entire community by maintaining sanitation for it. The Brahmin's duty is to look after the sanitation of the soul, the Bhangi's that of the body of society.

But there is a difference in practice ; the Brahmin generally does not live up to his duty, the Bhangi does willy-nilly, no doubt. Society is sustained by several services. The Bhangi constitutes the foundation of all services.

And yet our woebegone Indian society has branded the Bhangi as a social pariah, set him down at the bottom of the scale, held him fit only to receive kicks and abuse, a creature who must subsist on the leavings of the caste people and dwell on the dung-heap. He is without a friend, his very name has become a term of reproach. This is shocking. It is perhaps useless to seek the why and wherefore of it. I certainly am unaware of the origin of the inhuman conduct, but I know this much that by looking down upon the Bhangi we—Hindus, Mussalmans, Christians and all—have deserved the contempt of the whole world. Our villages have today become seats of dirt and insanitation and the villagers come to an early and untimely death. If only we had given due recognition to the status of the Bhangi as equal to that of a Brahmin, as in fact and justice he deserves, our villages today, no less than their inhabitants, would have looked a picture of cleanliness and order. We would have to a large extent been free from the ravages of a host of diseases which directly spring from our uncleanness and lack of sanitary habits.

I therefore make bold to state without any manner of hesitation or doubt that not till the invidious distinction between the Brahmin and the Bhangi is removed, will our society enjoy health, prosperity and peace and be happy.

What qualities should such an honoured servant of society exemplify in his person? In my opinion an ideal

Bhangi should have a thorough knowledge of the principles of sanitation. He should know how a right kind of latrine is constructed, and the correct way of cleaning it. He should know how to overcome and destroy the odour of excreta. He should know the various disinfectants to render them innocuous. He should likewise know the process of converting night-soil and urine into manure.

But that is not all. My ideal Bhangi would know the quality of night-soil and urine. He would keep a close watch on these and give a timely warning to the individual concerned. Thus he will give a timely notice of the results of his examination of the excreta. That presupposes a scientific knowledge of the requirements of his profession. He would likewise be an authority on the subject of disposal of night-soil in small villages as well as big cities and his advice and guidance in the matter would be sought for and freely given to society. It goes without saying that he would have the usual learning necessary for reaching the standard here laid down for his profession. Such an ideal Bhangi, while deriving his livelihood from his occupation, would approach it only as a sacred duty. In other words, he would not dream of amassing wealth out of it. He would consider himself responsible for the proper removal and disposal of all the dirt and night-soil within the area which he serves and regard the maintenance of healthy and sanitary condition within the same as the *summum bonum* of his existence.

To clothe the Bhangi with the dignity and respect due to him is the especial task and privilege of the educated class. Some members of the class would first

themselves master the science of sanitation to educate the Bhangis round them in the same. They would carefully study their present condition and the causes underlying it and set themselves to the task of eradicating the same by dint of inexhaustible perserverance and patience that never looks back and knows no defeat. They would teach them the laws of cleanliness. Our Bhangis do not today possess even good brooms or other suitable means for the removal of the night-soil. The latrines themselves are wretched. The site round the Bhangis' quarters is no better than a cesspool of dirt. All this can go only if some of the educated class give themselves up to the task of redeeming the Bhangi from his present plight and thus redeeming society from its terrible insanitation. Surely this is work enough to satisfy the highest ambition of one who has the spirit of service in him."—*Harijan*, November 28, 1936.

कृषिवयने हि ग्रामश्रियः पादद्वयम् ॥ ४३ ॥

43. Agriculture and weaving are indeed the two main props of rural prosperity.

"Some people spurn the idea of making, in this age of mechanism, hand-spinning and hand-weaving a national industry, but they forget there are millions of their countrymen in this age who for want of suitable occupation are eking out a most miserable existence, and thousands who die of starvation and under-feeding every year, whereas only a hundred years ago hand-spinning and hand-weaving proved an insurance against a pauper's death. The extent to which relief was provided by this industry is recorded by Mr. Dutt in his "History of India,

Victorian age" from the investigations conducted by Dr. Buchanan for seven years, 1813-1820. Dr. Buchanan travelled throughout the whole country. And his observations and statistics convinced him that next to agriculture hand-spinning and hand-weaving were the great national industries."—*Young India*, September 15, 1920.

"No one has ever said that spinning can be a means of livelihood except to the very poor. It is intended to restore spinning to its ancient position as a universal industry auxiliary to agriculture and resorted to by agriculturists during those months of the year when agricultural operations are suspended as a matter of course and cultivators have otherwise little to do."—*Young India*, July 6, 1921.

"The mission of Khadi is not merely to supply the townspeople with fashionable khadi that will vie with the mill manufactures and thus like other industries supply a few artisans with employment, but to become a supplementary industry to agriculture. This mission still remains unfulfilled."—*Harijan*, July 6, 1935.

"When Mr. Gandhi was asked about his occupation he uttered the three words :

Farmer and Weaver

with a slow, clear and emphatic accent. The magistrate was as if startled because the answer was so out of the ordinary. He paused a little before noting them down perhaps to ascertain whether Mr. Gandhi was really serious in making that declaration. Little did he know that Mr. Gandhi's whole philosophy of work and existence was summed up in those three

words and that they are the shibboleth of India's revolt against Western exploitation of her resources and the domination of Western culture and life."—*Young India*, March 15, 1922. -

तन्तुचक्रमेव मूलधारम् ॥ ४४ ॥

44. And the spinning wheel is its chief nerve centre.

"It was in London in 1908 that I discovered the wheel. I had gone there leading a deputation from South Africa. It was then that I came in close touch with many earnest Indians—students and others. We had many long conversations about the condition of India and I saw as in a flash that without the spinning wheel there was no Swaraj. I knew at once that every one had to spin. But I did not then know the distinction between the loom and the wheel, and in *Hind Swaraj* I used the word loom to mean the wheel."—*Young India*, September 20, 1928.

"I first became a weaver in 1915. I told you that I became first a weaver and then a spinner. I have woven with these very hands both foreign yarns and our mill yarns. (But you will excuse me for claiming to know more than you do the secret of this business.) As I was sitting—I can point out the spot where I was sitting—as I was sitting at my handloom weaving cloth, (certainly not half as fine as any of you perhaps weave) but as I was sitting at any loom, I was considering for myself where I should be and where thousands and ten thousands of weavers should be when mills were organised enough to weave that kind of cloth themselves. And as I was thinking of this thing my heart went out to the millions of starving sisters in our

villages, and I began, as I was weaving, to think of the lot of these sisters. I became sad and disconcerted and together with my companions I began a diligent search for some spinner who would teach us hand-spinning and I began also to find whether there was a single village where I could find hand-spinning still going on. I knew nothing then of the fact that there were some sisters spinning in the Punjab. But as despair was creeping over me, I took shelter under a brave widow of Gujarat. She was working in the cause of untouchables. I shared this deep sorrow of mine with this great sister and I charged her to wander from place to place in Gujarat and not rest content till she had found those sisters, who still had the art of hand-spinning in their possession. And it was she who discovered at Vijapur in Gujarat a few Musalman sisters who were prepared to spin if she would take their yarn from their hands. From that moment began the great revival which is now covering over fifteen hundred villages in India. And it was after this discovery that I decided not to weave a single thread of foreign yarn or mill-spun yarn in the Ashram of which I happened to be in charge.”—*Young India*, October 13, 1927.

“It is the cotton thread which, beginning in the humblest cottage of India and reaching the highest in the land, can alone indissolubly bind the two and make them feel akin.”—*Young India*, June 16, 1927.

“In such a scheme (of village industries) the spinning wheel becomes its centre. If you call it the solar system, the wheel becomes the golden disc and the industries the planets revolving round it in obedience to the inviolable law of the system. When the sun lost its illuminating

power by the action of the East India Company, the planets lost their power and became invisible or almost so. The sun is being reinstated in his past status now and the planets are 'regaining their motion in exact proportion to the strength of the sun.'—*Harijan*, January 2, 1937.

"I have often said that, if seven lakhs of the villages of India were to be kept alive, and if peace that is at the root of all civilization is to be achieved, we have to make the spinning wheel the centre of all handicrafts. Thus my faith in the spinning wheel is growing every day and I see it more and more clearly that the sun of the wheel will alone illumine the planets of other handicrafts. But I go a step further and say that just as we go on discovering new stars and planets in the vast solar system, even so we should go on discovering fresh handicrafts every day. But for the sake of this thing we have to make the spinning wheel the really life-giving sun."—*Harijan*, February 19, 1938.

तन्तुकरणं हि विशुद्धं कर्म सर्वेषां हितं सुकरं च ॥ ४५ ॥

45. For spinning is a pure form of labour, it is good for all and it is easy to do.

"The more I have studied the economics of India, the more I have listened to the mill-owners of India, the more convinced I have become that until we introduce the spinning wheel in every home of India, the economic salvation and freedom of India is an impossibility. Go to any mill-owner you like, he will tell you that it will require fifty years if India is to become self-contained so far as cloth supplies are concerned, if she has to depend

upon her mills alone. And let me supplement the information by telling you that today hundreds and thousands of weavers are weaving and are able to weave home-spun yarn, but they have to fall back upon foreign yarn because mills cannot supply them.”—*Young India*, February 2, 1921.

“The *Leader* considers that I am putting back the hands of the clock of progress by attempting to replace mill-made cloth and mill-spun yarn by hand-woven and hand-spun yarn. Now, I am making no such attempt at all. I have no quarrel with the mills. My views are incredibly simple. India requires nearly 13 yards of cloth per head per year. She produces, I believe, less than half the amount. India grows all the cotton she needs. She exports several million bales of cotton to Japan and Lancashire, receives much of it back in manufactured calico, although she is capable of producing all the cloth and all the yarn necessary for supplying her wants by hand-weaving and hand-spinning. India needs to supplement her main occupation, agriculture, with some other employment. Hand-spinning is the only such employment for millions. It was the national employment a century ago.”—*Young India*, August 18, 1920.

“Attacks on hand-spinning notwithstanding, I cling to the belief that Swaraj is unattainable without the beautiful art becoming universal in India. The reasoning applied to the proposition is incredibly simple. India cannot live unless her homes become self-supporting. They cannot become so, unless they have a supplementary occupation. It will, therefore, not avail if all our cloth was manufactured in our mills. If hand-spinning

became universal, every home would get a share of the crores and without any complicated machinery being necessary. And India is able to manufacture all her own cloth. It is understood that, when spinning becomes universal, the millions of weavers and lacs of carders will revert to their original occupation. This is the economic aspect of hand-spinning.

It will save our women from forced violation of their purity. It will, as it must, do away with begging as a means of livelihood. It will remove our enforced idleness. It will steady the mind. And I verily believe that when millions take to it as a sacrament, it will turn our faces Godward. This is the moral aspect of spinning.

And when it has become universal, and traffic in foreign cloth has become a thing of the past, it is the surest sign that India is earnest, sober and believes in the non-violent and religious character of her struggle.

At present outsiders do not believe in our ability to boycott foreign cloth and manufacture enough for our requirements by hand-spinning and hand-weaving. But when it becomes an established fact, India's opinion, too, will become an irresistible force, and if necessary, she can then, but not till then, resort to civil disobedience in order to bend a recalcitrant Government to its will. This is the political aspect."—*Young India*, September 22, 1921.

"I know that there are friends who laugh at this attempt to revive this great art. They remind me that in these days of mills, sewing machines or typewriters only a lunatic can hope to succeed in reviving the rusticated spinning wheel. These friends forget that the needle has not yet given place to the sewing machine,

nor has the hand lost its cunning in spite of the typewriter. There is not the slightest reason why the spinning wheel may not co-exist with the spinning mill, even as the domestic kitchen co-exists with hotels. Indeed typewriters and sewing machines may go, but the needle and the reed pen will survive. The mills may suffer destruction. The spinning wheel is a national necessity. I would ask sceptics to go to the many poor homes where the spinning wheel is again supplementing their slender resources and ask the inmates whether the spinning wheel has not brought joy to their homes.”—*Young India*, July 21, 1920.

“But khadi-wearers should know that the economics of khadi are different from the ordinary economics which are based on competition in which patriotism, sentiment and humanity play little or no part. Khadi economics are based on patriotism, sentiment and humanity.

Those who believe in the message of khadi will not consider any price too dear for khadi. It is the only real insurance against famine and unemployment. Even if India were to be industrialized over-night much of the unemployment would remain. In this country the problem is to find work for a whole nation which has one-fourth of her time without occupation. If pestilence, poverty and bloodshed are to be avoided there is no remedy but ‘khadi and other village industries.”—*Harijan*, July 23, 1938.

ग्रामाभ्युदयादेव देशाभ्युदयः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. The prosperity of a country depends on the prosperity of its villages.

"I have believed and repeated times without number that India is to be found not in its few cities but in its 7,00,000 villages. We town-dwellers have believed that India is to be found in its towns and that the villages were created to minister to our needs. We have hardly ever paused to inquire if those poor folks get sufficient to eat and clothe themselves with and whether they have a roof to shelter themselves from the sun and rain."—*Harijan*, April 4, 1936.

"The village movement is as much an education of the city people as of the villagers. Workers drawn from cities have to develop village mentality and learn the art of living after the manner of villagers. This does not mean that they have to starve like the villagers. But it does mean that there must be a radical change in the old style of life. While the standard of living in the villages must be raised the city standard has to undergo considerable revision without the worker being required in any way to adopt a mode of life that would impair his health."—*Harijan*, April 11, 1936.

"I have been saying that if untouchability stays, Hinduism goes; even so I would say that if the village perishes, India will perish too. It will be no more India. Her own mission in the world will get lost. The revival of the village is possible only when it is no more exploited."—*Harijan*, August 29, 1936.

"I want to resuscitate the villages of India. To-day our villages have become a mere appendage of the cities. They exist, as it were, to be exploited by the latter and depend on the latter's sufferance. This is unnatural. It is only when the cities realize the duty of making an ade-

quate return to the villages for the strength and sustenance which they derive from them instead of selfishly exploiting them, that a healthy and moral relationship between the two will spring up. And if the city children are to play their part in this great and noble work of social reconstruction, the vocations through which they are to receive their education ought to be directly related to the requirements of the villages. So far as I can see, the various processes of cotton manufacture, from ginning and cleaning of cotton to the spinning of yarn, answer this test as nothing else does. Even today cotton is grown in the villages and is ginned and spun and converted into cloth in the cities. But the chain of processes which cotton undergoes in the mills from the beginning to the end constitutes a huge tragedy of waste in men, materials and mechanical power.

My plan to impart Primary Education through the medium of village handicrafts like spinning and carding etc. is thus conceived as the spear-head of a silent social revolution fraught with the most far-reaching consequences. It will provide a healthy and moral basis of relationship between the city and the village and thus go a long way towards eradicating some of the worst evils of the present social insecurity and poisoned relationship between the classes. It will check the progressive decay of our villages and lay the foundation of a juster social order in which there is no unnatural division between the "haves" and "have-nots" and everybody is assured of a living wage and the right to freedom. And all this would be accomplished without the horrors of a bloody class war or a colossal capital expenditure such as would be involved in the mechanization of a vast

continent like India. Nor would it entail a helpless dependence on foreign imported machinery or technical skill. Lastly, by obviating the necessity for highly specialized talent, it would place the destiny of the masses, as it were, in their own hands.”—*Harijan*, October 9, 1937.

“An ideal Indian village will be so constructed as to lend itself to perfect sanitation. It will have cottages with sufficient light and ventilation built of a material obtainable within a radius of five miles of it. The cottages will have courtyards enabling householders to plant vegetables for domestic use and to house their cattle. The village lanes and streets will be free of all avoidable dust. It will have wells according to its needs and accessible to all. It will have houses of worship for all, also a common meeting place, a village common for grazing its cattle, a co-operative dairy, primary and secondary schools in which industrial education will be the central fact, and it will have panchayats for settling disputes. It will produce its own grains, vegetables and fruit, and its own khadi. This is roughly my idea of a model village.”—*Harijan*, January 9, 1937.

स्वदेशवस्तूपयोगाभिनिवेश एव प्रारम्भस्त्यागस्य ॥ ४७ ॥

47. The adoption of Swadeshi is the first step in renunciation.

“Swadeshi offers every man, women and child an occasion to make a beginning in self-sacrifice of a pure type.”—*Young India*, August 25, 1920.

“An industry to be Indian must be demonstrably in the interest of the masses; it must be manned by Indians

both skilled and unskilled. Its capital and machinery should be Indian and the labour employed should have a living wage and be comfortably housed, while the welfare of the children of the labourers should be guaranteed by the employers. This is an ideal definition.”—*Harijan*, October 23, 1937.

“Swadeshi is the law of laws enjoined by the present age. Spiritual laws, like Nature’s laws, need no enacting, they are self-acting. But through ignorance or other causes man often neglects or disobeys them. It is then that vows are needed to steady one’s course. A man who is by temperament a vegetarian needs no vow to strengthen his vegetarianism. For, the sight of animal food, instead of tempting him, would only excite his disgust. The law of Swadeshi is ingrained in the basic nature of man, but it has today sunk into oblivion. Hence the necessity for the vow of Swadeshi. In its ultimate and spiritual sense Swadeshi stands for the final emancipation of the human soul from its earthly bondage. For, this earthly tabernacle is not its natural or permanent abode, it is a hindrance in its onward journey, it stands in the way of its realising its oneness with other lives. A votary of Swadeshi, therefore, in his striving to identify himself with the entire creation seeks to be emancipated from the bondage of the physical body.

If this interpretation of Swadeshi be correct, then it follows that a votary will as a first duty dedicate himself to the service of his immediate neighbours. This involves exclusion or even sacrifice of the interests of the rest, but the exclusion or the sacrifice would be apparent only. Pure service of one’s neighbours can never, from its very

nature, result in disservice to those who are remotely situated, rather the contrary. 'As with the individual so with the Universe' is an unfailing principle which we would do well to lay to heart. On the other hand a man who allows himself to be lured by 'distant scene' and runs to the ends of the earth for service is not only foiled in his ambition but fails in his duty towards his neighbours also. Take a concrete instance. In the particular place where I live I have certain persons as my neighbours, some relations and dependants. Naturally, they all feel, as they have a right to, that they have a claim on me and look to me for help and support. Suppose now I leave them all at once and set out to serve people in a distant place. My decision would throw my little world of neighbours and dependants out of gear, while my gratuitous knight-errantry would more likely than not disturb the atmosphere in the new place. Thus a culpable neglect of my immediate neighbours and an unmerited disservice to the people whom I wish to serve would be the first fruits of my violation of the principles of Swadeshi. It is not difficult to multiply such instances. That is why the Gita says: "It is better to die performing one's duty or Swadharma, but Paradharma or another's duty is fraught with danger." Interpreted in terms of one's physical environment this gives us the law of Swadeshi. What the Gita says with regard to Swadharma equally applies to Swadeshi also, for Swadeshi is Swadharma applied to one's immediate environment.

It is only when the doctrine of Swadeshi is wrongly understood that mischief results, e.g., it would be a travesty of the doctrine of Swadeshi, if to coddle my

family I set about grabbing money by all means fair or foul. The law of Swadeshi requires me no more than to discharge my legitimate obligations towards my family by just means, and the attempt to do so will reveal to me the universal code of conduct. The practice of Swadeshi can never do harm to any one; if it does, it is not Swadharma but egotism that moves me.

There may come occasions when a votary of Swadeshi may be called upon to sacrifice his family at the altar of universal service. Such an act of willing immolation will then constitute the highest service rendered to the family. "Whosoever wants to save his life will lose it and whosoever loses his life for the Lord's sake will find it"—holds good for the family group no less than the individual. Take another instance. Supposing there is an outbreak of the plague in my village and in trying to serve the victims of the epidemic, I, my wife and children and all the rest of my family are wiped out of existence, then in inducing those dearest and nearest to join me I will not have acted as the destroyer of my family, but on the contrary as its truest friend. In Swadeshi there is no room for selfishness, or if there is selfishness in it, it is of the highest type which is not different from the highest altruism. Swadeshi in its purest form is the acme of universal service.

It was by following this line of argument that I hit upon Khadi as a necessary and the most important corollary of the principle of Swadeshi in its application to society. "What is the kind of service" I asked myself, "that the teeming millions of India most need at the present time, that can be easily understood and appreciated by all, that is easy to perform and will at the same

time enable the crores of our semi-starved countrymen to live ? ” And the reply came that it is the universalisation of Khadi or the spinning-wheel alone that can fulfil these conditions.

Let no one suppose that the practice of Swadeshi through Khadi would harm the foreign mill-owners. A thief who is weaned from his vice or is made to return the property that he has stolen is not harmed thereby, on the contrary, he is the gainer consciously in the one case, unconsciously in the other. Similarly, if all the opium addicts or the drunkards in the world were to shake themselves free from their vice, the canteen keepers or the opium vendors who would be deprived of their customers could not be said to be losers. They would be the gainers in the truest sense of the word. The elimination of the ‘wages of sin’ is never a loss either to the individual concerned or to society, it is pure gain.

It is the greatest delusion to suppose that the duty of Swadeshi begins and ends with merely spinning so much yarn anyhow and wearing Khadi made from it. Khadi is the first indispensable step towards the discharge of Swadeshi Dharma towards society. One often meets men who wear Khadi but in all other things indulge their taste for foreign manufactures with a vengeance. Such men cannot be said to be practising Swadeshi. They are simply following the fashion. A votary of Swadeshi will carefully study his environment and try to help his neighbours, wherever possible, by giving preference to local manufactures even if they are of an inferior grade or dearer in price than things manufactured elsewhere. He will try to remedy their defects but will not give them

up because of their defects and take to foreign manufactures.

But even Swadeshi like any other good thing can be ridden to death if it is made a fetish. That is a danger that must be guarded against. To reject foreign manufactures merely because they are foreign and to go on wasting national time and money to promote manufactures in one's country for which it is not suited would be criminal folly and a negation of the Swadeshi spirit. A true votary of Swadeshi will never harbour ill-will towards the foreigner, he will not be moved by antagonism towards anybody on earth. Swadeshism is not a cult of hatred. It is a doctrine of selfless service that has its roots in the purest Ahimsa, i.e., love."—*Young India*, June 18, 1931. -

"After much thinking, I have arrived at a definition of Swadeshi that perhaps best illustrates my meaning. Swadeshi is that spirit in us which restricts us to the use and service of our immediate surroundings to the exclusion of the more remote. Thus, as for religion, in order to satisfy the requirements of the definition, I must restrict myself to my ancestral religion, that is, the use of my immediate religious surrounding. If I find it defective, I should serve it by purging it of its defects. In the domain of politics I should make use of the indigenous institutions and serve them by curing them of their proved defects. In that of economics I should use only things that are produced by my immediate neighbours and serve those industries by making them efficient and complete where they might be found wanting. It is suggested that such Swadeshi, if reduced to practice, will lead to the millenium. And as we do not abandon

our pursuit after the millenium, because we do not expect quite to reach it within our times, so may we not abandon Swadeshi, even though it may not be fully attained for generations to come."—*Young India*, June 21, 1919.

"To say that boycott is the same as Swadeshi even in effect is not to understand either. Swadeshi is an eternal principle whose neglect has brought untold grief to mankind. It means production and distribution of articles manufactured in one's own country. In its narrow and present form it means the saving of sixty crores of rupees annually, through the instrumentality of the peasant population. It therefore also means giving seventy-two per cent of the population a much needed supplementary industry. Swadeshi is a constructive programme. Boycott, on the other hand, is a temporary makeshift resorted to in order to compel the hands of the British people by deliberately making an attempt to inflict a monetary loss on them. Boycott therefore operates as an undue influence brought in to secure one's purpose."—*Young India*, January 14, 1920.

न शोभते शिल्पं बाह्यरूपमात्रेण ॥ ४८ ॥

48. Art does not shine by its external form alone.

"To me Khaddar is any day more artistic than the finest Dacca muslin for its associations. Khaddar supports today those who were starving. It supports women who have been reclaimed from a life of shame or women, who, because they would not go out for work remained idle and quarrelled among themselves for want of occupation. Khaddar therefore has a soul about it. It

has an individuality about it.. The weaver is able to trace all the processes of its manufacture to the respective manufacturers. If our tastes were not debased, we would prefer Khaddar to sticky calico even during the summer season.”—*Young India*, April 28, 1920.

“ I assure you that a six months course of self-denial will show you that what we today regard as artistic is only falsely so and that true art takes note not merely of form but also of what lies behind. There is an art that kills and an art that gives life. The fine fabric that we have imported from the West or the far East has literally killed millions of our brothers and sisters and delivered thousands of our dear sisters to a life of shame. True art must be evidence of happiness, contentment and purity of its authors. And if you will have such art revived in our midst, the use of Khadi is obligatory on the best of you at the present moment.”—*Young India*, August 11, 1921.

“ “ How is it,” proceeded Ramachandran, “ that many intelligent and eminent men, who love and admire you, hold that you consciously or unconsciously have ruled out of the scheme of national regeneration all considerations of Art ? ” “ I am sorry,” replied Gandhiji, “ that in this matter I have been generally misunderstood. There are two aspects of things—the outward and the inward. It is purely a matter of emphasis with me. The outward has no meaning except in so far as it helps the inward. All true Art is thus the expression of the soul. The outward forms have value only in so far as they are the expression of the inner spirit of man.”

Ramachandran hesitatingly suggested : “ The great artists themselves have declared that Art is the transla-

tion of the urge and unrest in the soul of the artist into words, colours, shapes, etc." "Yes," said Gandhiji, "Art of that nature has the greatest possible appeal for me. But I know that many call themselves artists, and are recognised as such, and yet in their works there is absolutely no trace of the soul's upward urge and unrest."

"Have you any instance in mind?" "Yes," said Gandhiji, "take Oscar Wilde. I can speak of him, as I was in England at the time that he was being much discussed and talked about."

"I have been told," put in Ramachandran, "that Oscar Wilde was one of the greatest literary artists of modern times."

"Yes, that is just my trouble. Wilde saw the highest Art simply in outward forms and therefore succeeded in beautifying immorality. All true Art must help the soul to realise its inner self. In my own case, I find that I can do entirely without external forms in my soul's realisation. I can claim, therefore, that there is truly sufficient Art in my life, though you might not see what you call works of Art about me. My room may have blank walls; and I may even dispense with the roof, so that I may gaze out upon the starry heavens overhead that stretch in an unending expanse of beauty. What conscious Art of man can give me the panoramic scenes that open out before me, when I look up to the sky above with all its shining stars? This, however, does not mean that I refuse to accept the value of productions of Art, generally accepted as such, but only that I personally feel how inadequate these are compared with the eternal symbols of beauty in Nature. These productions of man's Art have their

value only so far as they help the soul onward towards self-realisation."

"But the artists claim to see and to find Truth through outward Beauty," said Ramachandran. "Is it possible to see and find Truth in that way?"

"I would reverse the order," Gandhiji immediately answered, "I see and find Beauty in Truth or through Truth. All Truths, not merely true ideas, but truthful faces, truthful pictures, or songs, are highly beautiful. People generally fail to see Beauty in Truth, the ordinary man runs away from it and becomes blind to the Beauty in it. Whenever men begin to see Beauty in Truth, then true Art will arise."

Ramachandran then asked, "But cannot Beauty be separated from Truth, and Truth from Beauty?"

"I should want to know exactly what is Beauty" Gandhiji replied. "If it is what people generally understand by that word, then they are wide apart. Is a woman with fair features necessarily beautiful?"

"Yes" replied Ramachandran without thinking.

"Even" asked Bapu, continuing his question, "if she may be of an ugly character?"

Ramachandran hesitated. Then he said, "But her face in that case cannot be beautiful. It will always be the index of the soul within. The true artist with the genius of perception will produce the right expression."

"But here you are begging the whole question," Gandhiji replied, "You now admit that mere outward form may not make a thing beautiful. To a true artist only that face is beautiful which, quite apart from its exterior, shines with the Truth within the soul. There is then, as I have said, no Beauty apart from Truth. On

the other hand, Truth may manifest itself in forms which may not be outwardly beautiful at all. Socrates, we are told, was the most truthful man of his time and yet his features are said to have been the ugliest in Greece. To my mind he was beautiful, because all his life was a striving after Truth, and you may remember that his outward form did not prevent Phidias from appreciating the beauty of Truth in him, though as an artist he was accustomed to see Beauty in outward forms also !'

"But Bapuji," said Ramachandran eagerly, "the most beautiful things have often been created by men whose own lives were not beautiful."

"That," said Gandhiji, "only means that Truth and Untruth often co-exist; good and evil are often found together. In an artist also not seldom the right perception of things and the wrong co-exist. Truly beautiful creations come when right perception is at work. If these moments are rare in life they are also rare in Art."—*Young India*, November 13, 1924.

न शब्दार्थविधारणमेव विद्या ॥ ४९ ॥

49. The mere knowledge of words and their meanings is no education.

"The ordinary meaning of education is a knowledge of letters. To teach boys reading, writing, and arithmetic is called primary education. A peasant earns his bread honestly. He has ordinary knowledge of the world. He knows fairly well how he should behave towards the parents, his wife, his children and his fellow-villagers. He understands and observes the rules of morality. But he cannot write his own name. What do you propose

to do by giving him a knowledge of letters? Will you add an inch to his happiness? Do you wish to make him discontented with his cottage or his lot? And even if you want to do that, he will not need such an education. Carried away by the flood of Western thought, we came to the conclusion, without weighing pros and cons, that we should give this kind of education to the people.”—*Hind Swaraj*, Page 77.

“I have not run down a knowledge of letters under all circumstances. All I have now shown is that we must not make of it a fetish. It is not our Kamdhuk. In its place it can be of use, and it has its place when we have brought our senses under subjection, and put our ethics on a firm foundation. And then, if we feel inclined to receive that education, we may make good use of it. As an ornament it is likely to sit well on us. It now follows that it is not necessary to make this education compulsory. Our ancient school system is enough. Character-building has the first place in it, and that is primary education. A building erected on that foundation will last.”—*Hind Swaraj*, Page 79.

“So many strange things have been said about my views on national education, that it would perhaps not be out of place to formulate them before the public.

In my opinion the existing system of education is defective, apart from its association with an utterly unjust Government, in three most important matters:—

- (1) It is based upon foreign culture to the almost entire exclusion of indigenous culture;
- (2) It ignores the culture of the heart and the hand, and confines itself simply to the head;

(3) Real education is impossible through a foreign medium.

Let us examine the three defects. Almost from the commencement, the text books deal, not with things the boys and the girls have always to deal with in their homes, but things to which they are perfect strangers. It is not through the text-books that a lad learns what is right and what is wrong in the home life. He is never taught to have any pride in his surroundings. The higher he goes, the farther he is removed from his home, so that at the end of his education he becomes estranged from his surroundings. He feels no poetry about the home life. The village scenes are all a sealed book to him. His own civilisation is presented to him as imbecile, barbarous, superstitious and useless for all practical purposes. His education is calculated to wean him from his traditional culture. And if the mass of educated youths are not entirely denationalised, it is because the ancient culture is too deeply embedded in them to be altogether uprooted even by an education adverse to its growth. If I had my way, I would certainly destroy the majority of the present text-books and cause to be written text-books which have a bearing on and correspondence with the home life, so that a boy as he learns may react upon his immediate surroundings.

Secondly, whatever may be true of other countries, in India at any rate where more than eighty per cent of the population is agricultural and another ten per cent industrial, it is a crime to make education merely literary, and to unfit boys and girls for manual work in after life. Indeed I hold that as the larger part of our time is devoted to labour for earning our bread, our children,

must from their infancy be taught the dignity of such labour. Our children should not be so taught as to despise labour. There is no reason why a peasant's son after having gone to a school should become useless, as he does become, as agricultural labourer. It is a sad thing that our school boys look upon manual labour with disfavour, if not contempt. Moreover, in India, if we expect, as we must, every boy and girl of school-going age to attend public schools, we have not the means to finance education in accordance with the existing style, nor are millions of parents able to pay the fees that are at present imposed. Education to be universal must therefore be free. I fancy that even under an ideal system of government, we shall not be able to devote two thousand million rupees which we should require for finding education for all the children of school-going age. It follows, therefore, that our children must be made to pay in labour partly or wholly for all the education they receive. Such universal labour to be profitable can only be (to my thinking) hand-spinning and hand-weaving. But for the purpose of my proposition, it is immaterial whether we have spinning or any other form of labour, so long as it can be turned to account. Only, it will be found upon examination that on a practical, profitable and extensive scale, there is no occupation other than the processes connected with cloth production which can be introduced in our schools throughout India.

The introduction of manual training will serve a double purpose in a poor country like ours. It will pay for the education of our children and teach them an occupation on which they can fall back in after life, if they choose, for earning a living. Such a system must

make our children self-reliant. Nothing will demoralise the nation so much as that we should learn to despise labour.

One word only as to the education of the heart. I do not believe that this can be imparted through books. It can only be done through the living touch of the teacher. And who are the teachers in the primary and even secondary schools? Are they men and women of faith and character? Have they themselves received the training of the heart? Are they even expected to take care of the permanent element in the boys and girls placed under their charge? Is not the method of engaging teachers for lower schools an effective bar against character? Do the teachers get even a living wage? And we know that the teachers of primary schools are not selected for their patriotism. They only come who cannot find any other employment.

Finally, the medium of instruction. My views on this point are too well known to need re-stating. The foreign medium has caused brain fag, put an undue strain upon the nerves of our children, made them crammers and imitators, unfitted them for original work and thought, and disabled them for filtrating their learning to the family or the masses. The foreign medium has made our children practically foreigners in their own land. It is the greatest tragedy of the existing system. The foreign medium has prevented the growth of our vernaculars. If I had the powers of a despot I would today stop the tuition of our boys and girls through a foreign medium, and require all the teachers and professors on pain of dismissal to introduce the change forthwith. I would not wait for the preparation of text-books. They

will follow the change. It is an evil that needs a summary remedy.”—*Young India*, September 1, 1921.

स्वविधैव प्रधानं इतरास्तु तदङ्गानि ॥ ५० ॥

50. One's own culture should be the main thing ;
other cultures are only subsidiary.

“ Nothing can be farther from my thought than we should become exclusive or erect barriers. But I do respectfully contend that an appreciation of other cultures can fitly follow, never precede an appreciation and assimilation of our own. It is my firm opinion that no culture has treasures so rich as ours has. We have not known it, we have been made to deprecate its study and depreciate its value. We have almost ceased to live it. An academic grasp without practice behind it is like an embalmed corpse, perhaps lovely to look at but nothing to inspire or ennoble. My religion forbids me to belittle or disregard other cultures as it insists, under pain of civil suicide, upon imbibing and living my own.”—*Young India*, September 1, 1921.

“ I do not want my house to be walled in on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the cultures of all the lands to be blown about my house, as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any. I refuse to live in other people's houses as an interloper, a beggar or a slave.”—*Young India*, June 1, 1921.

“ It is my considered opinion that English education in the manner in which it has been given has emasculated the English-educated Indian, it has put a severe strain upon the Indian students' nervous energy and has made
• of us imitators. The process of displacing the vernacular

has been one of the saddest chapters in the British connection.”—*Young India*, April 27, 1921.

“English is a language of international commerce, it is the language of diplomacy and it contains many a rich literary treasure, it gives us an introduction to Western thought and culture. For a few of us therefore a knowledge of English is necessary. They can carry on the departments of national commerce and international diplomacy and give to the nation the best of Western literature, thought and science. That would be the legitimate use of English. Whereas today English has usurped the dearest place in our hearts and dethroned our mother tongues. It is an unnatural place due to our unequal relations with Englishmen. The highest development of the Indian mind must be possible without a knowledge of English. It is doing violence to the manhood and especially the womanhood of India to encourage our boys and girls to think that an entry into the best society is impossible without a knowledge of English. It is too humiliating a thought to be bearable. To get rid of the infatuation for English is one of the essentials of Swaraj.”—*Young India*, February 2, 1921.

“No one will accuse me of any anti-English tendency. Indeed I pride myself on my discrimination. I have thankfully copied many things from them. Punctuality, reticence, public hygiene, independent thinking and exercise of judgment and several other things I owe to my association with them. But never having had the slightest touch of slave mentality in me and never having even a thought of materially benefiting myself through contact official or otherwise with them, I have had the

rare good fortune of studying them with complete detachment.”—*Young India*, March 6, 1930.

“Of myself, whilst I have freely acknowledged my debt to Western culture, I can say that whatever service I have been able to render to the nation has been due entirely to the retention by me of Eastern culture to the extent it has been possible. I should have been thoroughly useless to the masses as an anglicised, denationalised being knowing little or caring less for and perhaps even despising their ways, habits, thoughts and aspirations. It is difficult to estimate the loss of energy caused to the nation by her children being obliged to resist the encroachments of a culture which, however good in itself, was unsuited for them, whilst they had not imbibed and become rooted in their own.

Examine the question synthetically. Would Chaitanya, Nanak, Kabir, Tulasidas and host of other reformers have done better if they had been attached from their childhood to the most efficiently managed English schools? Would Dayanand have done better if he had become an M.A. of an Indian university? Where is among the easy-going, ease-loving English-speaking Rajas and Maharajas brought up from their infancy under the influence of Western culture one who could be named in the same breath as Shivaji who braved all perils and shared the simple life of his hardy men? Are they better rulers than Pratap the intrepid? Are they good specimens of Western culture, these Neroes who are fiddling in London and Paris whilst their Romes are burning? There is nothing to be proud of in their culture which has made them foreigners in their own

land and which has taught them to prefer to waste the substance of their ryots and their own souls in Europe to sharing the happiness and miseries of those over whom they are called by a higher power to rule.”—*Young India*, July 5, 1928.

स्वधर्मेऽभिमतिः परधर्मे चाभिरतिः ॥ ५१ ॥

51. Even so are love of one's own religion and interest in other religions.

“In this respect religion stands on the same footing as culture. Just as preservation of one's own culture does not mean contempt for that of others, but requires assimilation of the best that there may be in all the other cultures, even so should be the case with religion. Our present fears and apprehensions are a result of the poisonous atmosphere that has been generated in the country, the atmosphere of mutual hatred, ill-will and distrust. We are constantly labouring under a nightmare of fear lest some one should stealthily undermine our faith or the faith of those who are dear and near to us. But this unnatural state will cease when we have learnt to cultivate respect and tolerance towards other religions and their votaries.”—*Young India*, December 6, 1928.

“When, therefore, I talk of respecting the ancient tradition, you now understand what I mean. It is because I see the same God in the Bhagavad Gita as I see in the Bible and the Koran that I say to the Hindu boys that they will derive greater inspiration from the Bhagavad Gita because they will be tuned to the Gita more than to any other book.”—*Young India*, September 22, 1927.

“ My views on foreign missions are no secret. I have more than once expounded them before missionary audiences.

If instead of confining themselves purely to humanitarian work such as education, medical services to the poor and the like, they would use these activities of theirs for the purpose of proselytising, I would certainly like them to withdraw. Every nation considers its own faith to be as good as that of any other. Certainly the great faiths held by the people of India are adequate for her people. India stands in no need of conversion from one faith to another.

Let me now amplify the bald statement. I hold that proselytising under the cloak of humanitarian work is, to say the least, unhealthy. It is most certainly resented by the people here. Religion after all is a deeply personal matter, it touches the heart. Why should I change my religion because a doctor who professes Christianity as his religion has cured me of some disease or why should the doctor except or suggest such a change whilst I am under his influence ? Is not medical relief its own reward and satisfaction ? Or why should I, whilst I am in a missionary educational institution, have Christian teaching thrust upon me ? In my opinion these practices are not uplifting and give rise to suspicion, if not even secret hostility. The methods of conversion must be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion. Faith is not imparted like secular subjects. It is given through the language of the heart. If a man has a living faith in him, it spreads its aroma like the rose its scent. Because of its invisibility, the extent of its influence is far wider than that of the visible beauty of the colour of the petals.

I am, then, not against conversion. But I am against the modern methods of it. Conversion now-a-days has become a matter of business, like any other. I remember having read a missionary report saying how much it cost per head to convert and then presenting a budget for 'the next harvest.'—*Young India*, April 23, 1931.

"I believe that there is no such thing as conversion from one faith to another in the accepted sense of the term. It is a highly personal matter for the individual and his God. I may not have any design upon my neighbour as to his faith which I must honour even as I honour my own. For I regard all the great religions of the world as true, at any rate for the people professing them, as mine is true for me. Having reverently studied the scriptures of the world, I have no difficulty in perceiving the beauties in all of them. I could no more think of asking a Christian or a Mussalman or a Parsi or a Jew to change his faith than I would think of changing my own. This makes me no more oblivious of the limitations of the professors of those faiths, than it makes me of the grave limitations of the professors of mine. And seeing that it takes all my resources in trying to bring my practice to the level of my faith and in preaching the same to my co-religionists, I do not dream of preaching to the followers of other faiths. 'Judge not lest ye be judged' is a sound maxim for one's conduct. It is a conviction daily growing upon me that the great and rich Christian missions will render true service to India, if they can persuade themselves to confine their activities to humanitarian service without the ulterior motive of converting India or at least her unsophisticated villagers to Christi-

anity and destroying their social superstructure, which notwithstanding its many defects has stood now from time immemorial the onslaughts upon it from within and from without. Whether they—the missionaries—and we wish it or not, what is true in the Hindu faith will abide, what is untrue will fall to pieces. Every living faith must have within itself the power of rejuvenation, if it is to live.—*Harijan*, September 28, 1935.

यस्मात्सर्वे धर्मास्सत्यस्य शाखाः ॥ ५२ ॥

52. For all religions are branches of Truth.

“The tree of Religion is the same, there is not that physical equality between the branches. They are all growing and the person who belongs to the growing branch must not gloat over it and say, ‘Mine is a superior one!’ None is superior, none is inferior to the others.”—*Harijan*, March 13, 1937.

“But ultimately I came to the deliberate conviction that there was no such thing as only one true religion and every other false. There is no religion that is absolutely perfect. All are equally imperfect or more or less perfect, hence the conclusion that Christianity is as true and good as my own religion. But so also about Islam or Zoroastrianism or Judaism.”—*Harijan*, March 6, 1937.

“The Allah of Islam is the same as the God of Christians and the Ishwara of Hindus. Even as there are numerous names of God in Hinduism, there are many names of God in Islam. The names do not indicate individuality but attributes, and little man has tried in his

humble way to describe mighty God by giving Him attributes, though He is above all attributes, Indescribable, Immeasurable. Living faith in this God means acceptance of the brotherhood of mankind. It also means equal respect for all religions. If Islam is dear to you, Hinduism is dear to me and Christianity is dear to the Christians. It would be the height of intolerance—and intolerance is a species of violence—to believe that your religion is superior to other religions and that you would be justified in wanting others to change over to your faith.”—*Harijan*, May 14, 1938.

“My Hinduism is not sectarian. It includes all that I know to be the best in Islam, Christianity, Buddhism, and Zoroastrianism. I approach politics as everything else in a religious spirit. Truth is my religion, and Ahimsa is the only way of its realisation. I have rejected once and for all the doctrine of the sword.”—*Harijan*, April 30, 1938.

इति गान्धिसूत्रेषु सामान्यधर्मो नाम प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥

Thus in the Gandhi Sutras this is the first chapter entitled :

“The General Dharma”.

SECOND CHAPTER

सत्याग्रह इति धर्मस्यैव सनातनस्य नवोल्लेखः ॥ ५३ ॥

53. Satyagraha is a new manifestation of Sanatana Dharma.

“I see so much misapprehension about Satyagraha amongst us as well as Englishmen that though I have said and written much about it, I think it proper to say something even at the risk of repetition.

Satyagraha was a word coined in South Africa to name a certain movement. First even the Gujarati word for the great movement our countrymen in South Africa were carrying on was ‘passive resistance.’ Once I happened to address a meeting of Europeans in connection with the movement and on that occasion the European president of the meeting said that there was nothing active in the power of Indians, who were voteless and unarmed, to offer passive resistance, which could only be a weapon of the weak. He was my friend. He expressed these views without meaning any insult to us, but I felt humiliated. I was conscious that the nature of the fight that the Indians were offering in South Africa was not the result of their weakness. They had purposely decided on that sort of agitation. I took the next earliest opportunity to correct my friend’s views and demonstrated to him that it was beyond the power of weak men to put up a fight of the nature the Indians in South Africa were doing. They were exhibiting a greater courage than that required of a soldier.

Whilst in connection with the same movement I was in England, I saw that the suffragist women were burning buildings and whipping officers and were calling their own agitation by the name of 'passive resistance' and people also called it so. In the agitation of the Indians in South Africa there was no room for these violent acts. I thus saw that to let our movement be known by the name of 'passive resistance' was fraught with dangers. I could not find an English word that could correctly express our movement. In the meeting of Europeans above referred to I called our movement one of 'soul force.' But I could not dare to make the word current as expressive of our movement. Some capable Englishmen could see the imperfectness of the word 'passive resistance,' but they could not suggest a better word. I now see that "Civil Resistance" is the word which can correctly express our movement. Only some time ago I somehow hit upon this word and so I have now been using that word in English. "Civil Resistance" expresses much more than is conveyed by the word 'Civil Disobedience,' though it expresses much less than Satyagraha.

I also saw that in South Africa truth and justice were our only weapons, that the force we were putting forth was not brute-force but was soul-force, be it ever so little. This force is not found to be within the power of brutes, and as truth ever contains soul-force, the South African agitation began to be known in our vernaculars by the name of 'Satyagraha.'

That Satyagraha is thus based on purity is no exaggeration. We can now understand that Satyagraha is not merely Civil Disobedience. At times, it may be

Satyagraha not to offer Civil Disobedience. When it appears to us to be our duty to offer Civil Disobedience, when not to offer it seems to us derogatory to our manliness and to our soul—then only Civil Disobedience can be Satyagraha.

This Satyagraha can be offered not only against Government, but against family and society. In short, Satyagraha may be used as between husband and wife, father and son and between friends. We may use this weapon in any sphere of life and to get redress of any grievance. The weapon purifies one who uses it as one against whom it is used. A good use of the weapon can never be undesirable and it is ever infallible. If Satyagraha is converted into Duragraha and thus becomes fruitful of evil results, Satyagraha cannot be blamed.

This sort of Satyagraha consciously or unconsciously appears to be used mostly in families. That is to say, if a son finds that his father is unjust to him, he does not put up with the injustice and pays the penalty with pleasure, and in the end he succeeds in winning over his callous father and in having justice from him. But a deadening inertia prevents us from carrying Satyagraha beyond the family sphere. And I have therefore thought the use of Satyagraha in the political and social sphere to be a new experiment. Tolstoy in one of his letters drew attention to the fact that this was a new experiment.

There are some who believe that Satyagraha may be used only in the religious sphere. My wide experience points to a contrary conclusion. We may use it in other spheres and spiritualise them and by so doing hasten the victory and are saved many a false thing. I am firmly

of opinion that Satyagraha contains the observance of the manifest laws of economics and therefore I believe Satyagraha to be a practical affair. Satyagraha being, as I have shown above, a new-fangled weapon, it may take time to be understood and accepted by the people—and things pregnant with results great and good do take time—but when it pervades the land, political and social reforms, which today take very long time to be achieved, will be obtained in comparatively less time, the gulf that separates rulers and the ruled will be bridged over and trust and love will take the place of distrust and estrangement.

There is only one thing needful for a wide propagation of Satyagraha. If the leaders understand it correctly and put it before the people, I am sure the people are ready to welcome it. To understand its true beauty one should have unflinching faith in Truth and Non-violence. Truth does not require to be explained. I do not mean to enter here into a minute explanation of Non-violence. It means, in short, that we should not be actuated by spite against those from whom we seek to obtain justice, that we should never think of obtaining anything from him by any violence to his person, but by pure civility. If we can trust ourselves to be equal to only this much non-violence, the required reforms can be easily achieved.

When the whole nation adopts Satyagraha as an eternal weapon, all our movements will take a new form. We shall be spared much of the hubbub and stump oratory, much of petition-making and passing of resolutions and much of our mean selfishnesses. I see nothing in which lies the social economic and political advancement

of the nation so much as in Satyagraha."—*Young India*, September 13, 1919.

"Satyagraha differs from Passive Resistance as the North Pole from the South. The latter has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence for the purpose of gaining one's end. Whereas the former has been conceived as a weapon of the strongest and excludes the use of violence in any shape or form."—*Young India*, November 1919.

"Public Satyagraha is an extension of private or domestic Satyagraha. Every instance of public Satyagraha should be tested by imagining a parallel domestic case. Thus suppose in my family I wish to remove the curse of untouchability. Suppose further that my parents oppose the view, that I have the fire of the conviction of Prahlad, that my father threatens penalties, calls in even the assistance of the State to punish me. What should I do? May I invite my friends to suffer with me the penalties my father has devised for me? Or is it not up to me meekly to bear all the penalties my father inflicts on me and absolutely rely on the law of suffering and love to melt his heart and open his eyes to the evil of untouchability? It is open to me to bring in the assistance of learned men, the friends of the family, to explain to my father what he may not understand from me, his child. But I may allow no one to share with me the privilege and the duty of suffering. What is true of this supposed case of domestic Satyagraha is equally true and no less of the case we have imagined of public Satyagraha."—*Young India*, April 24, 1924.

“Satyagraha is utter self-effacement, greatest humiliation, greatest patience and brightest faith. It is its own reward.”—*Young India*, February 26, 1925.

“There is no such thing as compulsion in the scheme of non-violence. Reliance has to be placed upon the ability to reach the intellect and the heart—the latter rather than the former.

It follows that there must be power in the word of a Satyagraha general—not the power that the possession of limitless arms gives, but the power that purity of life, strict vigilance and ceaseless application produce. This is impossible without the observance of Brahmacharya. It must be as full as is humanly possible.”—*Harijan*, July 23, 1938.

सत्याग्रहएव सत्यशक्तिः प्रेमशक्तिरात्मशक्तिश्च ॥ ५४ ॥

54. Satyagraha is the same as truth-force, love-force or soul-force.

“Its root meaning is holding on to Truth, hence Truth-force. I have called it Love-force or Soul-force. I discovered in the earliest stages that pursuit of Truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one's opponent, but that he must be weaned from error by patience and sympathy. For what appears to be Truth to the one may appear to be error to the other. And patience means self-suffering. So the doctrine came to mean vindication of Truth, not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but on one's self.”—*Young India*, November, 1919.

“When I refuse to do a thing that is repugnant to my conscience, I use soul-force. For instance, the gov

ernment of the day has passed a law which is applicable to me. I do not like it. If, by using violence, I force the government to repeal the law, I am employing what may be termed body-force. If I do not obey the law and accept the penalty for its breach, I use soul-force. It involves sacrifice of self.”—*Hind Swaraj*, Page 69.

“Soul-force begins when man recognises that body-force, be it ever so great, is nothing compared to the force of the soul within, which pervades not only him but all creation.”—*Young India*, February 13, 1930.

प्रतिष्ठा स एव लोकस्य ॥ ५५ ॥

55. It is the basis of Society.

“The fact that there are so many men still alive in the world shows that it is based not on the force of arms but on the force of truth or love. Therefore the greatest and most unimpeachable evidence of the success of this force is to be found in the fact that, in spite of the wars of the world, it still lives on.

Thousands, indeed tens of thousands, depend for their existence on a very active working of this force. Little quarrels of millions of families in their daily lives disappear before the exercise of this force. Hundreds of nations live in peace. History does not and cannot take note of this fact.”—*Hind Swaraj*, Page 68.

* तस्य चलनादेव संघर्षः ततश्चरित्रारम्भः ॥ ५६ ॥

56. Its disturbance gives rise to conflict, which is the beginning of history.

“History is really a record of every interruption of the even working of the force of love or of the soul. Two

brothers quarrel, one of them repents and re-awakens the love that was lying dormant in him, the two again begin to live in peace, nobody takes note of this. But, if the two brothers, through the intervention of solicitors or some other reason, take up arms or go to law—which is another form of the exhibition of brute force—their doings would be immediately noticed in the press, they would be the talk of their neighbours and would probably go down to history.

And what is true of families and communities is true of nations. There is no reason to believe that there is one law for families, and another for nations. History, then, is a record of an interruption of the course of nature. Soul-force, being natural, is not noted in history.”—*Hind Swaraj*, Page 68.

अनेनैव ज्योतिषा निरस्यते निखिलदौर्जन्यान्धकारः ॥ ५७ ॥

57. It is by this light that all the darkness of tyranny is dispelled.

“I have more than once dilated in my writings on the limits of Satyagraha. Satyagraha presupposes self-discipline, self-control, self-purification and a recognised social status in the person offering it. A Satyagrahi must never forget the distinction between evil and the evil-doer. He must not harbour ill-will or bitterness against the latter. He may not even employ needlessly offensive language against the evil person, however unrelieved his evil might be. For it should be an article of faith with every Satyagrahi that there is no one so fallen in this world but can be converted by love. A Satyagrahi will always try to overcome evil by good, anger by love, untruth by

truth, himsa by ahimsa. *There is no other way of purging the world of evil.* Therefore a person who claims to be a Satyagrahi always tries by close and prayerful self-introspection and self-analysis to find out whether he is himself completely free from the taint of anger, ill-will and such other human infirmities, whether he is not himself capable of those very evils against which he is out to lead a crusade. In self-purification and penance lies half the victory of a Satyagrahi. A Satyagrahi has faith that the silent and undemonstrative action of truth and love produces far more permanent and abiding results than speeches or such other showy performances.”
—*Young India*, August 8, 1929.

जायते हि दौर्जन्यं राष्ट्रात्संघात्पुरुषाद्वा ॥ ५८ ॥

58. The tyranny may be that of the State or of Society or of the individual.

सर्वात्मना दौर्जन्यस्य निरसनमेव सत्याग्रहः ॥ ५९ ॥

59. Satyagraha is nothing but the resistance offered to tyranny by one's whole soul.

“Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means the putting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant.”—*Young India*, August 11, 1920.

अवृण्यस्तेनैव भवत्यात्मा ॥ ६० ॥

60. The soul becomes irresistible by it.

“It is a fundamental principle of Satyagraha that the tyrant whom the Satyagrahi seeks to resist has power

over his body and material possessions, but he can have no power over the soul. The soul can remain unconquered and unconquerable even when the body is imprisoned. The whole science of Satyagraha was born from a knowledge of this fundamental truth.”—*Young India*, May 21, 1931.

न कदाचिदपि पराजयस्तस्य ॥ ६१ ॥

61. Never is there any defeat in Satyagraha.

“Defeat has no place in the dictionary of non-violence.”—*Harijan*, February 20, 1937.

“The path of a Satyagrahi is beset with insurmountable difficulties. But in true Satyagraha there is neither disappointment nor defeat. As truth is all-powerful, Satyagraha can never be defeated.”—*Satyagraha Leaflet*, April 16, 1919.

“There is no time limit for a Satyagrahi, nor is there a limit to his capacity for suffering. Hence there is no such thing as defeat in Satyagraha. The so-called defeat may be the dawn of victory. It may be the agony of birth.”—*Young India*, February 19, 1925.

तत्र प्रमादाक्लेशस्तदनुष्ठातुरेव ॥ ६२ ॥

62. If a Satyagrahi errs, the suffering is his own.

“I can recall no time so magnificently suitable for leading India to the method of Satyagraha—not necessarily Civil Disobedience, but truth and non-violence—in which there is no defeat and in which, if there is any error, it hurts but those who err.”—*Young India*, March 24, 1920.

न निश्चयोऽस्मिन्नेव जन्मनि सिद्धिस्तत्याग्रहिण इति ॥ ६३ ॥

63. There is no certainty that a Satyagrahi will meet with victory in this life. •

मरणेन स महीयानेव भवति ॥ ६४ ॥

64. By death is he glorified.

“The triumph of Satyagraha consists in meeting death in the insistence on Truth.”—*Young India*, September 30, 1926.

आत्माभिव्यक्तिसाधनमेव देहः ॥ ६५ ॥

65. The body is only the means by which the soul manifests itself.

“From the standpoint of pure Truth, the body too is a possession. It has been truly said, that desire for enjoyment creates bodies for the soul. When this desire vanishes, there remains no further need for the body, and man is free from the vicious cycle of births and deaths. The soul is omnipresent ; why should she care to be confined within the cagelike body, or do evil and even kill for the sake of that cage ? We thus arrive at the ideal of total renunciation, and learn to use the body for the purposes of service so long as it exists, so much so that service, and not bread, becomes with us the staff of life. We eat and drink, sleep and awake, for service alone.” Such an attitude of mind brings us real happiness and the beatific vision in the fulness of time.”—*From Yeravda Mandir*, Page 39.

“And I would ask anxious friends not to worry about my health, accepting my assurance that I am in no hurry

to die and that therefore I shall be taking all the care of my body that is humanly possible for me, and is consistent with the ideals, to which the body is dedicated and which I hold to be more precious than the body. Let the friends rest assured, that if the nation has any use for this body of mine, it is because a serious attempt has been made for many a long year to hold it in trust for those ideals. I would ask them also to share my belief, which I hold even at the risk of being dubbed a fatalist, that not one hair or any one's body can be touched without His will and that when He has no use for our bodies, He defies all the care, attention and skill that money prestige, patriotism, friendship and what not can summon to one's assistance."—*Young India*, February 16, 1928.

अभयप्रदानमन्तरेण सत्याग्रहो दुराग्रहः ॥ ६६ ॥

66. Unless others have an assurance of safety, Satyagraha becomes Duragraha.

"It was in a practically uninhabited tract of country that I was arrested in South Africa when I was marching into prohibited area with over two to three thousand men and some women. The company included several Pathans and others who were able-bodied men. It was the greatest testimony of merit the Government of South Africa gave to the movement. They knew that we were as harmless as we were determined. It was easy enough for that body of men to cut to pieces those who arrested me. It would have not only been a most cowardly thing to do, but it would have been a treacherous breach of their own pledge and it would have meant ruin to the.

struggle for freedom and the forcible deportation of every Indian from South Africa. But the men were no rabble. They were disciplined soldiers and all the better for being unarmed. Though I was torn from them, they did not disperse, nor did they turn back. They marched on to their destination till they were every one of them arrested and imprisoned. So far as I am aware, this was an instance of discipline and non-violence for which there is no parallel in history. Without such restraint I see no hope of successful mass civil disobedience here.”—*Young India*, August 4, 1921.

“There is no civil disobedience possible until the crowds behave like disciplined soldiers. And we cannot resort to civil disobedience unless we can assure every Englishman that he is safe in India, as he is in his own home. It is not enough that we give the assurance. Every Englishman and Englishwoman must feel safe, not by reason of the bayonet at their disposal but by the reason of our living creed of non-violence. That is the condition not only of success but our own ability to carry on the movement in its present form. There is no other way of conducting the campaign of non-co-operation.”—*Young India*, August 25, 1921.

निर्बन्धोऽपि दुराग्रहः ॥ ६७ ॥

67. Compulsion too is Duragraha.

“We may not use compulsion even in the matter of doing a good thing. Any compulsion will ruin the cause. I feel that we are within reach of the goal. But all the marvellous work done during this week of self-purification will be undone if the movement is vitiated by the

introduction of compulsion. ' This is a movement of conversion, not of compulsion even of the tyrant.—*Young India*, April 17, 1930. '

तथैव बहिष्कारस्संघात् ॥ ६८ ॥

68. So also is excommunication.

" Social boycott is an age-old institution. It is coeval with caste. It is the one terrible sanction exercised with great effect. It is based upon the notion that a community is not bound to extend its hospitality or service to an excommunicate. It answered when every village was a self-contained unit and the occasions of recalcitrancy were rare. But when opinion is divided, as it is to-day, on the merits of non-co-operation, when its new application is having a trial, a summary use of social boycott in order to bend a minority to the will of the majority is a species of unpardonable violence. If persisted in, such boycott is bound to destroy the movement. Social boycott is applicable and effective when it is not felt as a punishment and accepted by the object of boycott as a measure of discipline. Moreover, social boycott to be admissible in a campaign of non-violence must never savour of inhumanity. It must be civilised. It must cause pain to the party using it, if it causes inconvenience to its object. Thus, depriving a man of the services of a medical man is an act of inhumanity tantamount in the moral code to an attempt to murder. I see no difference in murdering a man and withdrawing medical aid from a man who is on the point of dying. Even the laws of war, I apprehend, require the giving of medical relief to the enemy in need of it.

To deprive a man of the use of an only village well is notice to him to quit that village. Surely, non-co-operators have acquired no right to use that extreme pressure against those who do not see eye to eye with them. Impatience and intolerance will surely kill this great religious movement. We may not make people pure by compulsion. Much less may we compel them by violence to respect our opinion. It is utterly against the spirit of democracy we want to cultivate.

There are no doubt serious difficulties in our way. The temptation to resort to social boycott is irresistible when a defendant, who submits to private arbitration, refuses to abide by its award. Yet it is easy to see that the application of social boycott is more than likely to arrest the splendid movement to settle disputes by arbitration which, apart from its use as a weapon in the armoury of non-co-operation, is a movement fraught with great good to the country. People will take time before they accommodate themselves to private arbitration. Its very simplicity and inexpensiveness will repel many people even as palates jaded by spicy foods are repelled by simple combinations. All awards will not always be above suspicion. We must therefore rely upon the intrinsic merits of the movement and the correctness of awards to make itself felt.”—*Young India*, February 16, 1921.

“I hope, therefore, that non-co-operation workers will beware of the snares of social boycott. But the alternative to social boycott is certainly not social intercourse. A man who defies strong clear public opinion on vital matters is not entitled to social amenities and privilege. We may not take part in his

social functions such as marriage feasts, we may not receive gifts from him. But we dare not deny social service. The latter is a duty. Attendance at dinner parties and the like is a privilege which it is optional to withhold or extend. But it would be wisdom to err on the right side and to exercise the weapon even in the limited sense described by me on rare and well-defined occasions. And in every case the user of the weapon will use it at his own risk. The use of it is not as yet in any form a duty. No one is entitled to its use if there is any danger of hurting the movement.”—*Young India*, February 16, 1921.

“Non-co-operation is a process of purification and we must continually try to touch the hearts of those who differ from us, their minds and their emotions, but never their bodies. Discipline and restraint are the cardinal principles of our conduct and I warn you against any sort of tyrannical social ostracism.”—*Young India*, December 22, 1920.

स्वार्थाय प्रायोपवेशश्च ॥ ६९ ॥

69. And fasting oneself to death for gaining a selfish object.

“In India we often see beggars threatening to fast or fasting or pretending to fast, until they receive what they ask for. This is Duragrahi fasting and the person so fasting degrades himself and it will be the proper thing to let such people fast. It is false kindness to give anything under pressure of such fasting.”—*Satyagraha Leaflet*, May 7, 1919.

“Of course, it is not to be denied that fasts can be really coercive. Such are fasts to attain a selfish object. A fast undertaken to wring money from a person or for fulfilling some such personal end would amount to the exercise of coercion or undue influence. I would unhesitatingly advocate resistance of such undue influence. I have myself successfully resisted it in the fasts that have been undertaken or threatened against me. And if it is argued that the dividing line between a selfish and an unselfish end is often very thin, I would urge that a person who regards the end of a fast to be selfish or otherwise base should resolutely refuse to yield to it, even though the refusal may result in the death of the fasting person.”—*Harijan*, September 9, 1933.

अजातशत्रुस्त्याग्रही ॥ ७० ॥

70. A Satyagrahi has no enemies.

“The man who is saturated with the spirit of non-violence has never any quarrel with a single individual. His opposition is directed to a system, to the evil in man, but not against the man himself.”—*Young India*, April 4, 1929.

अनशनव्रतेन ईश्वरप्रणिधानेन च सत्यं जानाति ॥ ७१ ॥

71. He discovers Truth by fasting and prayer.

“First and foremost in the programme for the holy National Week, I put fasting and prayer. I have said enough to emphasise the necessity of both of these for the unfoldment of our national life. I speak of these from personal experience.

Throughout my wanderings in India, I have had the privilege of mixing with men of all creeds, of mixing with thousands of men, hundreds upon hundreds of students. I have discussed with them national problems with a passion which I am unable to describe. I have found that we have not yet reached a conscious recognition of our national state. We have not had the discipline necessary for a realisation of that state, and I venture to say that there is nothing so powerful as fasting and prayer that would give us the requisite discipline, spirit of self-sacrifice, humility and resoluteness of will without which there can be no real progress. I hope therefore that millions throughout India will open the Satyagraha week with sincere fasting and prayer.”—*Young India*, March 31, 1920.

“Fasting is regarded by all religions as a great discipline. Those who voluntarily fast become gentle and purified by it. A pure fast is a very powerful prayer. It is no small thing for lakhs of people voluntarily to abstain from food and such a fast is a Satyagrahi fast. It ennobles individuals and nations.”—*Satyagraha Leaflet*, May 7, 1919.

“And to pray to God is nothing but that sacred alliance between God and man whereby he attains his deliverance from the clutches of the prince of darkness. But a heartfelt prayer is not a recitation with the lips. It is a yearning from within which expresses itself in every word, every act, nay, every thought of man. When an evil thought successfully assails him, he may know that he has offered but a lip prayer and similarly with regard to an evil word escaping his lips or an evil

act done by him. Real prayer is an absolute shield and protection against this trinity of evils. Success does not always attend the very first effort at such real living prayer. We have to strive against ourselves, we have to believe in spite of ourselves, because months are as our years. We have therefore to cultivate illimitable patience as we will realise the efficacy of prayer. There will be darkness, disappointment and even worse; but we must have courage enough to battle against all these and not succumb to cowardice. There is no such thing as retreat for a man of prayer.”—*Young India*, December 20, 1928.

“Just as a prayer may be merely a mechanical intonation as of a bird, so a fast may be a mere mechanical torture of the flesh. Such mechanical contrivances are valueless for the purpose intended. Again just as a mechanical chant may result in the modulation of voice a mechanical fast may result in purifying the body. Neither will touch the soul within. But a fast undertaken for fuller self-expression, for attainment of the spirit’s supremacy over the flesh, is a most powerful factor in one’s evolution.”—*Young India*, February 16, 1922.

“But why pray at all? Does not God, if there be one, know what has happened? Does He stand in need of prayer to enable Him to do His duty?

No, God needs no reminder. He is within everyone. • Nothing happens without His permission. Our prayer is a heart-search. It is a reminder to ourselves that we are helpless without His support. No effort is complete without prayer—without a definite recognition that the best human endeavour is of no effect if it has not God’s blessing behind it. Prayer is a call to humility.

It is a call to self-purification, to inward search.”—*Harijan*, June 8, 1935.

ईश्वर एव तस्य निवासश्शरणं सुहृत् ॥ ७२ ॥

72. God alone is his abode, refuge and friend.

“A Satyagrahi has no power he can call his own. All the power he may seem to possess is from and of God. He therefore moves towards his goal carrying the world’s opinion with him. Without the help of God he is lame, blind, groping.”—*Young India*, April 3, 1930.

“The fact is that Satyagraha presupposes the living presence and guidance of God. The leader depends not on his own strength but on that of God. He acts as the voice within guides him. Very often therefore what are practical politics so called are unrealities to him, though in the end his prove to be the most practical politics.”—*Young India*, August 2, 1928.

महात्मनां च पन्थानमनुसरति ॥ ७३ ॥

73. He also follows in the footsteps of the great.

“As all Satyagraha activity should be guided by the religious spirit, I have suggested that we should fast for twenty-four hours and devote the day to religious contemplation and it is to be hoped that all the members of families including children and servants will take part in the religious observance. Hindus may have *Bhagvad Gita* read to them. It takes four hours to read through it with clear pronunciation, and other religious books might be read in addition or in place of it. The Mahomedans and others may have their own scriptures

read to them. It will be a proper way of spending the day to read the stories of great Satyagrahis such as Prahlad, Harischandra, Mirabai, Imams Hasan and Hoosein, Socrates and others.”—*Satyagraha Leaflet*, May 6, 1919.

पन्थानं प्रह्लादनन्दप्रभृतीनाम् ॥ ७४ ॥

74. The footsteps of Prahlada, Nandanar and others.

“The duty of non-co-operation with unjust men and kings is as strictly enjoined by all the religions as is the duty of co-operation with just men and kings. Indeed most of the scriptures of world seem even to go beyond non-co-operation and prefer violence to effiminate submission to wrong. The Hindu religious tradition clearly proves the duty of non-co-operation. Prahlad dissociated himself from his father, Mirabai from her husband, Vibhishan from his brutal brother.”—*Young India*, August 4, 1920.

“I knew that Chidambaram must be a place of pilgrimage for me. I have never claimed to be the one original Satyagrahi. What I have claimed is the application of that doctrine on an almost universal scale, and it yet remains to be seen and demonstrated that it is a doctrine which is capable of assimilation by thousands upon thousands of peoples in all ages and climes. I know, therefore, that mine is an experiment still in the making, and it therefore always keeps me humble and rooted to the soil and in that state of humility I always cling to every true example of Satyagraha that comes under my notice, as a child clings to its mother’s breast, and so when I heard and read the story of Nandanar and his lofty Satyagraha and his great success, my head

bowed before his spirit and all the day long I have felt elevated to be able to be in a place hallowed by the holy feet of Nanda, and it will not be without a wrench that I shall be leaving this place in a few minutes' time.

By his indomitable spirit and by his overwhelming faith in God, Nanda was able to bear down the haughty spirit of the haughty Brahmans and to show that in his spirit he was infinitely superior to his persecutors, who considered themselves first among mankind. But let the Panchama Adi-Dravida brothers and sisters profiting by the example of Nanda, live up to the spirit which they have inherited.

Nanda broke down every barrier and won his way to freedom not by brag, not by bluster, but by the purest form of self-suffering. He did not swear against his persecutors, he would not even condescend to ask his persecutors for what was his due. But he shamed them into doing justice by his lofty prayer, by the purity of his character, and, if one may put it in human language, he compelled God Himself to descend and made Him open the eyes of the persecutors. And what Nanda did in his time and in his own person, it is open to every one of us today in our own person. And I wish that you, my hearers, will catch something of the spirit of Nanda and if so many of us could possibly imitate Nanda and assimilate a spark of his spirit we can make this land a land again of holy people. I hope and pray that the temple with which the trustees have identified me to-day will keep green the memory of that great saint by keeping the atmosphere about the temple always pure. I would very much like to leave the atmosphere about this place at this stage filled with the spirit of Nanda."—*Young India*, September 22, 1927.

तथैव नागनारायणवल्लीनां च ॥ ७५ ॥

75. Similarly of Nagappan, Narayanaswami and Valliamma.

“I do not claim the credit for it. It is rather due to the women and young people like Nagappan, Narayanaswamy and Valliamma who have died for the cause and to those who quickened the conscience of South Africa.”—*Farewell Speech at Durban* on July 18, 1914.

“It was last, but not least, Johannesburg that had given Valliamma, that young girl whose picture rose before him even as he spoke, who had died in the cause of truth. Simple-minded in faith—she had not the knowledge that he had—she did not know what passive resistance was, she did not know what it was the community would gain, but she was simply taken up with unbounded enthusiasm for her people, went to gaol, came out of it a wreck and within a few days died. It was Johannesburg again that produced a Nagappan and a Narayanaswamy, two lovely youths hardly out of their teens, who also died. But both Mrs. Gandhi and he stood living before them. He and Mrs. Gandhi had worked in the limelight; those others had worked behind the scenes not knowing where they were going except this that what they were doing was right and proper, and if any praise was due anywhere at all, it was due to those three who died.”—*Farewell Speech at Johannesburg*.

“But, sir, if one-tenth of the language that has been used in this address is deserved by us, what language do you propose to use for those who have lost their lives and therefore finished their work on behalf of your

suffering countrymen in South Africa ? What language do you propose to use for Nagappan and Narayana-swamy, lads of seventeen or eighteen years who braved in simple faith all the trials, all the sufferings and all the indignities for the sake of honour of the motherland ? What language do you propose to use with reference to Valliamma, that sweet girl of seventeen years, who was discharged from Maritzburg prison, skin and bone, suffering from fever to which she succumbed after about a month's time ?"—*Speech at Madras on April 21, 1915.*

सत्यं शीलं दमस्थैर्यं निर्भयत्वं च नम्रता ।

ऐकमत्यं शमस्त्यागस्तहिष्णोस्सहजा गुणाः ॥ ७६ ॥

76. Truth, purity, self-control, firmness, fearlessness, humility, unity, peace and renunciation—these are the inherent qualities of a civil resister.

इति गान्धिसूत्रेषु सत्याग्रहधर्मो नाम द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥

Thus in the Gandhi Sutras, this is the second chapter entitled :

The Dharma of Satyagraha

THIRD CHAPTER

सत्याग्रहोऽयं वटः अनन्तास्तस्य शाखाः ॥ ७७ ॥

77. This Satyagraha is like a banyan tree, and innumerable are its branches.

“Satyagraha is like a banyan tree with innumerable branches. Civil Disobedience is one such branch. Satya (truth) and ahimsa (non-violence) together make the parent trunk from which all innumerable branches shoot out. We have found, by bitter experience, that whilst in an atmosphere of lawlessness, Civil Disobedience found ready acceptance, Satya (truth) and Ahimsa (non-violence) from which alone Civil Disobedience can worthily spring, have commanded little or no respect. Ours, then, is a Herculean task, but we may not shirk it. We must fearlessly spread the doctrine of Satya and Ahimsa, and then and not till then, shall we be able to undertake mass Satyagraha.”—*Letter*, April 18, 1919.

“Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience are but different branches of the same tree called Satyagraha. It is my Kalpadaru—my Jam-i-Jam—the universal provider. Satyagraha is search of truth; and God is Truth. Ahimsa or non-violence is the light that reveals that Truth to me.”—*Congress Presidential Address*, December 26, 1924.

असहकारोद्यमस्तत्रैका ॥ ७८ ॥

78. Non-co-operation is one branch.

“This method is to refuse to be party to the wrong. No tyrant has ever yet succeeded in his purpose without

carrying the victim with him, it may be, as it often is, by force. Most people choose rather to yield to the will of the tyrant than to suffer for the consequences of resistance. Hence does terrorism form part of the stock-in-trade of the tyrant. But we have instances in history where terrorism has failed to impose the terrorist's will upon his victim. India has the choice before her now."—*Young India*, June 9, 1920.

"In my humble opinion Non-co-operation with evil is as much a duty as is co-operation with good. But in the past, non-co-operation has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evil-doer. I am endeavouring to show to my countrymen that violent non-co-operation only multiplies evil and that, as evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal of support of evil requires complete abstention from violence. Non-co-operation implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-co-operation with evil."—*Gandhi's Written Statement in the Great Trial : Young India*, March 23, 1922.

"If a father does an injustice, it is the duty of his children to leave the parental roof. If the headmaster of a school conducts his institution on an immoral basis, the pupils must leave the school. If the chairman of a corporation is corrupt, the members thereof must wash their hands clean of his corruption by withdrawing from it ; even so, if a government does a grave injustice, the subject must withdraw co-operation wholly or partially, sufficiently to wean the ruler from his wickedness. In each of the cases conceived by me, there is an element of suffering whether mental or physical. Without such suffering, it is not possible to attain freedom."—*Young India*, June 16, 1920.

“Even the most despotic government cannot stand except for the consent of the governed, which consent is often forcibly procured by the despot. Immediately the subject ceases to fear the despotic force, his power is gone.”—*Young India*, June 30, 1920.

“Undoubtedly a cause must be grave to warrant the drastic method of national Non-co-operation.”—*Young India*, July 21, 1920.

“Non-co-operation in itself is more harmless than Civil Disobedience, but in its effect it is far more dangerous for the Government than Civil Disobedience. Non-co-operation is intended so far to paralyse the Government as to compel justice from it. If it is carried to the extreme point, it can bring the Government to a standstill.”—*Young India*, July 28, 1920.

शासनोलङ्घनं द्वितीया ॥ ७९ ॥

79. Civil disobedience is another.

“A little reflection will show that civil disobedience is a necessary part of non-co-operation. You assist an administration most effectively by obeying its orders and decrees. An evil administration never deserves such allegiance. Allegiance to it means partaking of the evil. A good man will therefore resist an evil system or administration with his whole soul. Disobedience of the laws of an evil state is therefore a duty. Violent disobedience deals with men who can be replaced. It leaves the evil itself untouched and often accentuates it. Non-violent i.e., civil disobedience is the only and the most successful remedy and is obligatory upon him who would dissociate himself from evil.

There is danger in civil disobedience, only because it is still only a partially tried remedy and has always to be tried in an atmosphere surcharged with violence. For when tyranny is rampant much rage is generated among the victims. It remains latent because of their weakness and bursts in all its fury on the slightest pretext. Civil disobedience is a sovereign method of transmuting this undisciplined life-destroying latent energy into disciplined life-saving energy whose use ensures absolute success. The attendant risk is nothing compared to the result promised. When the world has become familiar with its use and when it has had a series of demonstrations of its successful working, there will be less risk in civil disobedience than there is in aviation, in spite of that science having reached a high-stage of development.”—*Young India*, March 27, 1930.

“Hence Satyagraha largely appears to the public as civil disobedience or civil resistance. It is civil in the sense that it is not criminal. The law breaker breaks the law surreptitiously and tries to avoid the penalty; not so the civil resister. He ever obeys the laws of the State to which he belongs not out of fear of the sanctions, but because he considers them to be good for the welfare of the society. But there come occasions, generally rare, when he considers certain laws to be so unjust as to render obedience to them a dishonour. Hence he then openly and civilly breaks them and quietly suffers the penalty for their breach. And in order to register his protest against the action of the law-givers it is open to him to withdraw his co-operation from the State by disobeying such other laws whose breach does not involve moral turpitude.”—*Young India*, November, 1919.

“ Complete civil disobedience is rebellion without the element of violence in it. An out-and-out civil resister simply ignores the authority of the State. He becomes an outlaw claiming to disregard every unmoral state law. Thus, for instance, he may refuse to pay taxes, he may refuse to recognise the authority of the State in his daily intercourse. He may refuse to obey the law of trespass and claim to enter military barracks in order to speak to the soldiers, he may refuse to submit to limitations upon the manner of picketing and may picket within the prescribed area. In doing all this he never uses force and never resists force when it is used against him. In fact, he invites imprisonment and other uses of force against himself. This he does because and when he finds the bodily freedom he seemingly enjoys to be an intolerable burden. He argues to himself, that a State allows personal freedom only in so far as the citizen submits to its regulations. Submission to the State law is the price a citizen pays for his personal liberty. Submission, therefore to a State wholly or largely unjust is an immoral barter for liberty. A citizen who thus realises the evil nature of a State is not satisfied to live on its sufferance, and therefore appears to the others who do not share his belief to be a nuisance to society whilst he is endeavouring to compel the State without committing a moral breach to arrest him. Thus considered civil resistance is a most powerful expression of a soul's anguish and an eloquent protest against the continuance of an evil State. Is not this the history of all reforms? Have not reformers, much to the disgust of their fellows, discarded even innocent symbols associated with an evil practice? ”—*Young India*, November 10, 1921.

“ It is now necessary to understand the exact distinction between aggressive civil disobedience and defensive. Assertive or, offensive civil disobedience is non-violent, wilful disobedience of laws of the State whose breach does not involve moral turpitude and is undertaken as a symbol of revolt against the State. Thus disregard of laws relating to revenue or regulation of personal conduct for the convenience of the State, although such laws in themselves inflict no hardship and do not require to be altered, would be assertive, aggressive or offensive civil disobedience.

Defensive civil disobedience on the other hand is involuntary or reluctant non-violent disobedience of such laws as are in themselves bad and obedience to which would be inconsistent with one's self-respect or human dignity. Thus formation of volunteer corps for peaceful purposes, holding of public meetings for like purposes, publication of articles not contemplating or inciting to violence in spite of prohibitory orders is defensive civil disobedience. And so is the conducting of peaceful picketing undertaken with a view to wean people from things or institutions picketed in spite of orders to the contrary. The fulfilment of the conditions mentioned above is as necessary for defensive civil disobedience as for offensive civil disobedience.”—*Young India*, February 9, 1922.

सहकारे पापसंभिन्ने असहकार एव परमो धर्मः ॥ ८० ॥

80. When co-operation involves sin, non-co-operation becomes the highest duty.

“If a brother has fundamental differences with his brother, and association with the latter involves his partaking of what, in his opinion is an injustice, I hold that it is his brotherly duty to refrain from serving his brother and sharing his earnings with him. This happens in everyday life. Prahlad did not act against his father, when he declined to associate himself with the latter's blasphemies. Nor was Jesus anti-Jewish when he declaimed against the Pharisees and the hypocrites and would have none of them.”—*Young India*, May 19, 1920.

“It was a sign of religious atrophy to sustain an unjust Government that supported an injustice by resort to untruth and camouflage. So long therefore the Government did not purge itself of the canker of injustice and untruth it was their duty to withdraw all help from it consistently with their ability to preserve order in the social structure.”—*Young India*, August 4, 1920.

स एव सम्यगनुष्ठितः निरूढं प्रेम भवति ॥ ८१ ॥

81. If non-co-operation is properly observed, it grows into deep love.

“I accept the interpretation of Ahimsa, namely, it is not merely a negative state of harmlessness, but it is a positive state of love, of doing good even to the evil-doer. But it does not mean helping the evil-doer to continue the wrong or tolerating it by passive acquiescence. On the contrary, love, the active state of Ahimsa, requires you to resist the wrong-doer by dissociating yourself from him, even though it may offend him or injure him physically. Thus if my son lives a life of

shame, I may not help him to do so by continuing to support him. On the contrary, my love for him requires me to withdraw all support from him although it may mean even his death. And the same love imposes on me the obligation of welcoming him to my bosom when he repents. But I may not by physical force compel my son to become good.”—*Young India*, August 25, 1920.

“My non-co-operation has its root not in hatred, but love. My personal religion peremptorily forbids me to hate anybody. I learnt this simple yet grand doctrine when I was twelve years old through a school book and the conviction has persisted up to now. It is daily growing on me. I beg therefore to assure every Englishman, that I shall never be guilty of hating Englishmen, even though I might have to fight them fiercely, even as I did in 1921. It will be a non-violent fight, it will be clean, it will be truthful.

Mine is not an exclusive love. I cannot love Mussalmans or Hindus and hate Englishmen. For if I merely love Hindus and Mussalmans because their ways on the whole are pleasing to me, I shall soon begin to hate them when their ways displease me, as they may well do any moment. A love that is based on the goodness of those whom you love is a mercenary affair, whereas true love is self-effacing and demands no consideration. It is like that of a model Hindu wife, Sita, for instance, who loved her Rama even whilst he bid her pass through a raging fire. It was well with Sita for she knew what she was doing. She sacrificed herself out of her strength, not out of her weakness. Love is the strongest force the world possesses, and yet it is the humblest imaginable.”—*Young India*, August 6, 1925.

पारुष्यसहितश्चेत्कलुषी भवति ॥ ८२ ॥

82. If it is accompanied by violence, it becomes sinful.

“Non-co-operation in the sense used by me must be non-violent and therefore neither punitive nor vindictive nor based on malice, ill-will or hatred.—*Young India*, August 25, 1920.

पारुष्यरहितश्चेत्कालुष्योन्मूलको भवति ॥ ८३ ॥

83. If it is devoid of violence, it roots out sin.

“I have therefore ventured to suggest the remedy of non-co-operation which enables those who wish to dissociate themselves from the Government and which, if it is unattended by violence and undertaken in an ordered manner, must compel it to retrace its steps and undo the wrongs committed.”—*Young India*, August 4, 1920.

धर्मात्मा राजनीतिषु धर्ममेवाचरति ॥ ८४ ॥

84. A righteous man is righteous even in politics.

“I must not deceive the country. For me there is no politics without religion—not the religion of the superstitious and the blind, the religion that hates and fights, but the universal religion of toleration. Politics without morality is a thing to be avoided. Then says the critic, ‘I must retire from all public activity.’ Such, however, is not my experience. I must try to live in society and yet remain untouched by its pitfalls.”
.—*Young India*, November 27, 1924.

एकैकः पौरस्तास्वधिकृतः ॥ ८५ ॥

85. Each individual citizen has a responsibility in politics.

"Most people do not understand the complicated machinery of the Government. They do not realise that every citizen silently but none the less certainly sustains the government of the day in ways of which he has no knowledge. Every citizen therefore renders himself responsible for every act of his Government. And it is quite proper to support it so long as the actions of the Government are bearable. But when they hurt him and his nation, it becomes his duty to withdraw his support."—*Young India*, July 28, 1920.

राजनीतौ हि संवृतिर्दोषः ॥ ८६ ॥

86. Secrecy is a sin in politics.

"I feel thankful to God that for years past I have come to regard secrecy as a sin, more especially in politics. If we realised the presence of God as witness to all we say and do, we would not have anything to conceal from anybody on earth. For we would not think unclean thoughts before our Maker, much less speak them. It is uncleanness that seeks secrecy and darkness. The tendency of human nature is to hide dirt; we do not want to see or touch dirty things, we want to put them out of sight. And so must it be with our speech. I would suggest that we should avoid even thinking thoughts, we would hide from the world.

This desire for secrecy has bred cowardice amongst us and has made us dissemble our speech. The best and the quickest way of getting rid of this corroding and

degrading secret service is for us to make a final effort to think everything aloud, to have no privileged conversation with any soul on earth and cease to fear the spy. We must ignore his presence and treat everyone as a friend entitled to know all our thoughts and plans. I know that I have achieved most satisfactory results from evolving the boldest of my plans in broad daylight.”—*Young India*, December 22, 1920.

शठं प्रति शाठ्यमिति तिलकः ॥ ८७ ॥

87. “Deceit towards the deceitful”, says Tilak.

शठं प्रत्यपि सत्यमिति गान्धिः ॥ ८८ ॥

88. “Truth even to the untruthful”, says Gandhi.

“Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak is no more. It is difficult to believe of him as dead. He was so much part of the people. No man of our times had the hold on the masses that Tilak had. The devotion that he commanded from thousands of his countrymen was extraordinary. He was unquestionably the idol of his people. His word was law among thousands. A giant among men has fallen. The voice of the lion is hushed.

What was the reason for his hold upon his countrymen? I think the answer is simple. His patriotism was a passion with him. He knew no religion but love of his country. He was a born democrat. He believed in the rule of majority with an intensity that fairly frightened me. But that gave him his hold. He had an iron will which he used for his country. His life was an open book. His tastes were simple. His private life was spotlessly clean. He had dedicated his wonderful talents to his country. No man preached the gospel

of Swaraj with the consistency and the insistence of Lokamanya. His countrymen therefore implicitly believed in him. His courage never failed him. His optimism was irrepresible. He had hoped to see Swaraj fully established during his lifetime. If he failed, it was not his fault. He certainly brought it nearer by many a year. It is for us, who remain behind, to put forth redoubled effort to make it a reality in the shortest possible time.”—*Young India*, August 4, 1920.

“I cannot claim the honour of being a follower of the late Lokamanya. I admire him like millions of his countrymen for his indomitable will, his vast learning, his love of country, above all, the purity of his private life and great sacrifice. Of all the men of modern times, he captivated most the imagination of his people. He breathed into us the spirit of Swaraj. No one perhaps realised the evil of the existing system of Government as Mr. Tilak did. And in all humility I claim to deliver his message to the country as truly as the best of his disciples. But I am conscious that my method is not Mr. Tilak’s method.”—*Young India*, July 13, 1921.

“When I wrote the sentence about ‘everything being fair in politics’ according to the Lokamanya’s creed, I had in mind his oft-repeated quotation : शठं प्रति शाठ्यम्. To me it enunciates a bad law. And I shall not despair of the Lokamanya with all his acumen agreeably surprising India one day with a philosophical dissertation proving the falsity of the doctrine. In any case, I pit the experience of a third of a century against the doctrine underlying शठं प्रति शाठ्यम्. The true law is शठं प्रत्यपि सत्यम्.—*Young India*, January 28, 1920.

त्रासाविष्टा शिष्टिर्न स्थातुमर्हति ॥ ८९ ॥

89. A government based on fear does not deserve to exist.*

“A Government that exists by terror does not deserve to exist at all.”—*Young India*, November 19, 1919.

“Let not the public think that the acts of the Government of the day are dictated only by fear and expediency, not by logic and high principles of justice.”—*Young India*, March 26, 1920.

तथैव या द्यूतमद्यादिकमनुमन्यते ॥ ९० ॥

90. Even so, that which permits gambling, drinking, etc.

“It did one’s soul good to find that during the National Week speakers at public meetings insisted upon the total prohibition of intoxicating drinks and drugs. It is a reform that is overdue. And, if it is at all worth going to the Councils, this total prohibition must be made a prominent plank in the electoral campaign. Every member must be pledged not merely to support but to initiate and pursue the total prohibition campaign, the only way to bring about total prohibition being to cut out from the military expenditure a portion equivalent to the revenue derived from this immoral source. The demand therefore for total prohibition must go hand in hand with the demand for reduction in the military expenditure. Nor must the solution be delayed by plans of taking referendums. In India there can be no reason for any referendum because drink and drug habit are universally

recognised as a vice. Drink is not a fashion in India as it is in the West. To talk therefore of a referendum in India is to trifle with the problem.”—*Young India*, April 22, 1926.

“Thieving will abide till doomsday. Must it therefore be licensed? Is thieving of the mind less criminal than thieving of matter? Illicit distillation to an extent will no doubt go on. Its quantity will be the measure of the Government’s effort assisted by a vigilant public in the shape of continuous and sympathetic treatment of the drinker and the opium-eater. Moral elevation demands a price no less than material or physical elevation. But my submission is that this constructive effort is doomed to failure if it is not preceded by total prohibition. So long as the State not only permits but provides facilities for the addict to satisfy his craving, the reformer has little chance of success.”—*Harijan*, September 25, 1937.

“I know nothing of horse racing. I have ever looked upon it with horror for its associations. I know that many men have been ruined on the race-course.

But I must confess I have not had the courage to write anything against it. Having seen even prelates, Viceroys, and those that are considered the best in the land openly patronising it and spending thousands upon it, I have felt it to be useless to write about it.

What is required is a total destruction of the pest. Betting at races is a part of the gambling mania. If only the people will non-co-operate, the evil will die a natural death. Thousands who attend the race course do so merely for fun. They attend either to see horses run breathlessly or because it is the fashion, but they, never-

theless, aid and abet the ruin of many a gambler.”
—*Young India*, April 27, 1921.

“The law must be against this gambling. But it is of no avail, if public opinion is not behind it. It is therefore necessary for workers to bestir themselves as they did during the plague or as they have done for the earthquake relief. They must not be satisfied till the evil is rooted out. In a way it is worse than the plague or the 'quake. For it destroys the soul within. A person without the soul is a burden upon the earth.”—*Harijan*, June 15, 1935.

प्राणदण्डमपि दुर्जनशिष्टेस्सुजनो वृणीते ॥ ९१ ॥

91. A righteous man courts even the penalty of death from a wicked Government.

“A Government that is evil has no room for good men and women except in its prisons.”—*Young India*, September 22, 1921.

“For me solitary confinement in a prison cell without any breach on my part of the code of non-co-operation or private or public morals will be freedom. For me the whole of India is a prison, even as the master's house is to his slave. A slave, to be free, must continuously rise against the slavery and be locked up in his master's cell for his rebellion. The cell-door is the door to freedom. I feel no pity for those who are suffering hardships in the gaols of the Government. Innocence under an evil Government must ever rejoice on the scaffold.”—*Young India*, June 15, 1921.

असहकारोद्यमे सर्वेऽप्यधिकारिणः शासनोलङ्घने
कतिचनैव ॥ ९२ ॥

92. For non-co-operation all are competent, but for civil disobedience only a few.

“By its very nature, Non-co-operation is even open to children of understanding and can be safely practised by the masses. Civil Disobedience presupposes the habit of willing obedience to laws without fear of their sanctions. It can therefore be practised only as a last resort and by a select few in the first instance at any rate. Non-co-operation, too, like Civil Disobedience is a branch of Satyagraha which includes all non-violent resistance for the vindication of Truth.”—*Young India*, March 21, 1921.

शासनोलङ्घने शासनानुवर्तिन एवाधिकारिणः ॥ ९३ ॥

93. Only those who habitually obey laws are competent to disobey them.

“As Satyagraha is being brought into play on a large scale on the political field for the first time, it is in an experimental stage. I am therefore ever making new discoveries. And my error in trying to let Civil Disobedience take the people by storm, appears to me to be Himalayan because of the discovery I have made, namely, that he only is able and attains the right to offer Civil Disobedience who has known how to offer voluntary and deliberate obedience to the laws of the State, in which he is living. It is only after one has voluntarily obeyed such laws a thousand times that an occasion rightly comes to him civilly to disobey certain laws. Nor

is it necessary for voluntary obedience that the laws to be obeyed must be good. There are many unjust laws which a good citizen obeys so long as they do not hurt his self-respect or the moral being, and when I look back upon my life, I cannot recall a single occasion when I have obeyed a law whether of society or the State because of the fear of punishment. I have obeyed bad laws of the Society, as well as of the State, believing that it was good for me and the State or the Society to which I belonged to do so, and I feel that having regularly and in a disciplined manner done so, the call for disobedience to a law of the Society came when I went to England in 1888, and to a law of the State in South Africa when the Asiatic Registration Act was passed by the Transvaal Government.”—*Young India*, July 9, 1919.

न ह्यसादराजकत्वमधर्मो वा ॥ ९४ ॥

94. Civil disobedience would never lead to anarchy or injustice.

“I wish I could persuade everybody that civil disobedience is the inherent right of a citizen. He dare not give it up without ceasing to be a man. Civil disobedience is never followed by anarchy. Criminal disobedience can lead to it. Every State puts down criminal disobedience by force. It perishes if it does not. But to put down civil disobedience is to attempt to imprison conscience. Civil disobedience can only lead to strength and purity. A civil resister never uses arms and hence, he is harmless to the State that is at all willing to listen to the voice of public opinion. He is dangerous

for an autocratic State, for he brings about its fall by engaging public opinion upon the matter for which he resists the State. Civil disobedience, therefore, becomes a sacred duty when the State has become lawless, or which is the same thing, corrupt. And a citizen, that barter with such a State shares its corruption or lawlessness."—*Young India*, January 5, 1922.

अहिंसाश्रितत्वात् ॥ ९५ ॥

95. For it is wedded to non-violence.

"Civil disobedience is sometimes a peremptory demand of love. Dangerous it undoubtedly is, but no more than the encircling violence. Civil disobedience is the only non-violent escape from its soul-destroying heat. The danger lies only in one direction, in the outbreak of violence side by side with civil disobedience. The struggle in freedom's battle of non-violence against violence, no matter from what quarter the latter comes, must continue till a single representative is left alive. More no man can do, to do less would be tantamount to want of faith."—*Young India*, February 20, 1930.

निर्याजं निरवज्ञं निर्मदं निरसूयं निरवद्यमेवेदं भवति ॥ ९६ ॥

96. There is no deceit nor disrespect nor pride nor envy nor sin in it.

"Disobedience to be civil must be sincere, respectful, restrained, never defiant, must be based upon some well-understood principle, must not be capricious and, above all, must have no ill-will or hatred behind it."—*Young India*, March 24, 1920.

एकोऽपि शासनोल्लङ्घको विशुद्धश्चेदधर्मोन्मूलनस्य
प्रभवति ॥ ९७ ॥

97. One perfect civil resister is enough to root out injustice.

“Self-sacrifice of one innocent man is a million times more potent than the sacrifice of million men who die in the act of killing others. The willing sacrifice of the innocent is the most powerful retort to insolent tyranny that has yet been conceived by God or man.”—*Young India*, February 12, 1925.

“A body of civil resisters is therefore, like an army subject to all the discipline of a soldier, only harder because of want of excitement of an ordinary soldier’s life. And as a civil resistance army is or ought to be free from passion, because free from the spirit of retaliation, it requires the fewest number of soldiers. Indeed one perfect civil resister is enough to win the battle of Right against Wrong.”—*Young India*, November 10, 1921.

“The acquisition of the spirit of non-resistance is a matter of long training in self-denial and appreciation of the hidden forces within ourselves. It changes one’s outlook upon life. It puts different values upon things and upsets previous calculations. And when once it is set in motion, its effect, if it is intensive enough, can overtake the whole universe. It is the greatest force because it is the highest expression of the soul. All need not possess the same measure of conscious non-resistance for its full operation. It is enough for one person only to possess it, even as one general is enough to regulate and dispose of the energy of millions of soldiers who enlist under his banner even though they

know not the why and wherefore of his dispositions. The monkeys of one Rama were enough to confound the innumerable host armed from head to foot of the ten-headed Ravana.”—*Young India*, September 23, 1926.

प्रजानां शासनोलङ्घनं यद्यहिंसापरं निरोद्धुं न शक्यम् ॥ ९८ ॥

98. It is impossible to resist the civil disobedience of the people, if it is thoroughly non-violent.

प्रजानां दौर्जन्यं तु राज्ञां दौर्जन्यादधिकतरमयहेतुः ॥ ९९ ॥

99. Violence on the part of the people is to be feared more than the violence of the rulers.

“Personally I do not mind Governmental fury as I mind mob fury. The latter is a sign of national distemper and therefore more difficult to deal with than the former which is confined to a small corporation. It is easier to oust a Government that has rendered itself unfit to govern than it is to cure unknown people in a mob of their madness.”—*Young India*, July 1920.

परिज्ञाते प्रमादे ततः प्रतिनिवृत्त्य पुनस्सुपथैवानुवर्तनं धर्मः ॥ १०० ॥

100. When we see that we have gone wrong, it is our duty to retrace our footsteps and proceed again by the right path.

“There is no harm in surrender. We shall gain strength by retracing every false or hasty step. What may have been taken wrongly must be given up and can be retaken by methodical work.”—*Young India*, January 26, 1922.

“For, confession of error is like a broom that sweeps away dirt and leaves the surface cleaner than before.

I feel stronger for my confession. And the cause must prosper for the retracing. Never has man reached his destination by persistence in deviation from the straight path.”—*Young India*, February 16, 1922.

नेता समूहैर्न नीयेत ॥ १०१ ॥

101. A leader should never be led by the mob.

“Those who claim to lead the masses must resolutely refuse to be led by them, if we want to avoid mob law and desire ordered progress for the country. I believe that mere protestation of one’s opinion and surrender to the mass opinion is not only not enough, but in matters of vital importance, leaders must act contrary to the mass of opinion if it does not commend itself to their reason.”—*Young India*, July 14, 1929.

“A leader is useless when he acts against the prompting of his own conscience, surrounded as he must be by people holding all kinds of views. He will drift like an anchorless ship, if he has not the inner voice to hold him firm and guide him.”—*Young India*, February 23, 1922.

राष्ट्राभ्युदयः प्रायस्संजायते क्रमिकपरिणामेन ॥ १०२ ॥

102. States generally progress by gradual evolution.

आकस्मिकेन परिवर्तनेन वा ॥ १०३ ॥

103. But suddenly also by revolution.

“Nations have progressed both by evolution and revolution. The one is as necessary as the other. Death, which is an eternal verity, is revolution, as birth and

after is a slow and steady evolution. Death is as necessary for man's growth as life itself. God is the greatest revolutionist the world has ever known or will know. He sends deluges. He sends storms where a moment ago there was calm. He levels down mountains which he builds with exquisite care and infinite patience. I do watch the sky and it fills me with awe and wonder. In the serene blue sky, both of India and England, I have seen clouds gathering and bursting with a fury which has struck me dumb. History is more a record of wonderful revolutions than of so-called ordered progress—no history more so than the English. I have seen people trudging slowly up mountains and have also seen men shooting up the air through great heights.”—*Young India*, February 2, 1922.

“If we are to make progress, we must not repeat history, but make new history. We must add to the inheritance left by our ancestors. If we may make new discoveries and inventions in the phenomenal world, must we declare our bankruptcy in the spiritual domain? Is it impossible to multiply the exceptions so as to make them the rule? Must man always be brute first and man after, if at all?”—*Young India*, May 6, 1926.

सत्याग्रहएव शस्त्रं भारतीयानाम् ॥ १०४ ॥

104. For the people of India, Satyagraha is the only weapon.

“India's past training for ages, I mean the training of the masses, has been against violence. Human nature in India has advanced so far that the doctrine of non-violence is more natural for the people at large than that of violence.”—*Young India*, January 26, 1922.

"I hold that the world is sick of armed rebellions. I hold too that, whatever may be true of other countries, a bloody revolution will not succeed in India. The masses will not respond. A movement in which masses have no active part can do no good to them. A successful bloody revolution can only mean further misery for the masses. For it would be still foreign rule for them. The non-violence I teach is active non-violence of the strongest. But the weakest can partake in it without becoming weaker. They can only be the stronger for having been in it. The masses are far bolder today than they ever were. A non-violent struggle necessarily involves construction on a mass scale. It cannot therefore lead to *tamas* or darkness or inertia. It means a quickening of the national life. That movement is still going on silently almost imperceptibly, but none the less surely."—*Young India*, February 12, 1925.

"India's destiny lies not along the bloody way of the West, of which she knows signs of tiredness, but along the bloodless way of peace that comes from a simple and godly life. India is in danger of losing her soul. She cannot lose it and live. She must not therefore lazily and helplessly say, "I cannot escape the onrush from the West." She must be strong enough to resist it for her own sake and that of the world."—*Young India*, October 7, 1926.

"If India makes violence her creed, and I have survived, I would not care to live in India. She will cease to evoke any pride in me. My patriotism is subservient to my religion. I cling to India like a child to its mother's breast, because I feel that she gives me the spiritual nourishment I need. She has the environment

that responds to my highest aspiration. When that faith is gone, I shall feel like an orphan without hope of ever finding a guardian. Then the snowy solitude of the Himalayas must give what rest it can to my bleeding soul.”—*Young India*, April 6, 1921.

“If India gains her freedom by a clash of arms, it will indefinitely postpone the day of real peace for the world. History is a record of perpetual wars, but we are trying to make new history, and I say this as I represent the national mind so far as non-violence is concerned. I have reasoned out the doctrine of the sword, I have worked out its possibilities and come to the conclusion that man’s destiny is to replace the law of the jungle with the law of conscious love.”—*Harijan*, July 3, 1937.

“My faith in non-violence remains as strong as ever. I am quite sure that not only should it answer all our requirements in our country, but that it should, if properly applied, prevent the bloodshed that is going on outside India and is threatening to overwhelm the Western world.

My aspiration is limited. God has not given me the power to guide the world on the path of non-violence. But I have imagined that He has chosen me as His instrument for presenting non-violence to India for dealing with her many ills. The progress already made is great. But much more remains to be done.”—*Harijan*, July 23, 1938.

अनेनैव तेषां स्वाराज्यसिद्धिः ॥ १०५ ॥

105. With that alone can they attain Swaraj.

"Swaraj is our birthright. No one can deprive us of it, unless we forfeit it ourselves. We have forfeited it and we have to win it back. Swaraj does not depend on jail-going. If it did, there are thousands of prisoners in jail today. It depends on everyone doing his or her own task."—*Harijan*, June 1, 1935.

"If the struggle so auspiciously begun is continued in the same spirit of non-violence to the end not only shall we see Purna Swaraj established in our country before long, but we shall have given to the world an object-lesson worthy of India and her glorious past.

Swaraj won without sacrifice cannot last long. I would therefore like our people to get ready to make the highest sacrifice that they are capable of. In true sacrifice all the suffering is on one side—one is required to master the art of getting killed without killing, of gaining life by losing it. May India live up to this mantra!"—*Young India*, May 8, 1930.

"Let there be no mistake about my conception of Swaraj. It is complete independence of alien control and complete economic independence. So at one end you have political independence, at the other the economic. It has two other ends. One of them is moral and social, the corresponding end is Dharma, i.e., religion in the highest sense of the term. It includes Hinduism, Islam, Christianity etc., but is superior to them all. You may recognize it by the name of Truth, not the honesty of expedience but the living Truth that pervades everything and will survive all destruction and all transformation. Moral and social uplift may be recognized by the term we are used to, i.e., non-violence. Let us call this the square of Swaraj which will be out of shape if

any of its angles is untrue. In the language of the Congress we cannot achieve this political and economic freedom without truth and non-violence, in concrete terms, without a living faith in God and hence moral and social elevation.

By political independence I do not mean an imitation of the British House of Commons, or the Soviet rule of Russia or the Fascist rule of Italy or the Nazi rule of Germany. They have systems suited to their genius. We must have ours suited to ours. What that can be is more than I can tell. I have described it as Ramraj i.e. sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority. The Congress constitutions of Nagpur and Bombay for which I am mainly responsible are an attempt to achieve this type of Swaraj.

Then take economic independence. It is not a product of industrialization of the modern or the Western type. Indian economic independence means to me the economic uplift of every individual male and female by his or her own conscious effort. Under that system all men and women will have enough clothing—not mere loin cloth, but what we understand by the term necessary articles of clothing—and enough food including milk and butter which are today denied to millions.

This brings me to socialism. Real socialism has been handed down to us by our ancestors who taught, "All land belongs to Gopal, where then is the boundary line? Man is the maker of that line and he can therefore unmake it." Gopal literally means shepherd; it also means God. In modern language it means the State i.e., the people. That the land today does not belong to the people is too true. But the fault is not in the teaching. It is in us who have not lived up to it.

I have no doubt that, we can make as good an approach to it as is possible for any nation, not excluding Russia, and that without violence. The most effective substitute for violent dispossession is the wheel with all its implications. Land and all property is his who will work it. Unfortunately the workers are or have been kept ignorant of this simple fact.”—*Harijan*, January 2, 1937.

सत्ययुगं शनैरभ्येति जगत्सर्वम् ॥ १०६ ॥

106. The whole world is slowly moving towards a golden age.

“I think that the world is moving towards peace i.e., Ahimsa. The way of violence has been tried for ages and has been found wanting. Let no one believe that the people in Russia, Italy, and other countries are happy or are independent. The sword of Damocles is always hanging over their heads.”—*Young India*, February 4, 1926.

तन्मार्गदर्शि भारतवर्षम् ॥ १०७ ॥

107. India points the way.

“I do believe that if India has patience enough to go through the fire of suffering and to resist any unlawful encroachment upon its own civilisation which, imperfect though it undoubtedly is, has hitherto stood the ravages of time, she can make a lasting contribution to the peace and solid progress of the world.”—*Young India*, August 11, 1927.

“There is no doubt that if India succeeds in regaining her liberty through non-violent means, she would

have delivered her message to the others who are fighting for it and what is perhaps more, she would have made the largest contribution yet known to world peace.”—*Young India*, April 15, 1926.

“I am fully aware that my mission cannot be fulfilled in India alone, but I hope I am humble enough to recognise my limitations and to see that I must keep for the time being to my restricted Indian platform till I know the result of the experiment in India itself. As I have already replied, I would like to see India free and strong so that she may offer herself as willing and pure sacrifice for the betterment of the world.”—*Young India*, September 17, 1925.

दिक्कालाद्यनवच्छिन्नस्सनातनोऽयं धर्मः ॥ १०८ ॥

108. The Sanatana Dharma that is set forth here is not conditioned by place or time.

“My modesty has prevented me from declaring from the house-top that the message of non-co-operation, non-violence and Swadeshi is a message to the world. It must fall flat, if it does not bear fruit in the soil where it has been delivered. At the present moment India has nothing to share with the world save her degradation, pauperism and plagues. Is it her ancient Shastras that we would send to the world? Well, they are printed in many editions, and an incredulous and idolatrous world refuses to look at them, because we the heirs and custodians do not live them. Before, therefore, I can think of sharing with the world, I must possess.”—*Young India*, October 13, 1921.

“I feel that I have as yet no message to deliver personally to the West. I believe my message to be

universal, but as yet I feel that I can best deliver it through my work in my own country. If I can show visible success in India, the delivery of the message becomes complete. If I came to the conclusion that India had no use of my message, I should not care to go elsewhere in search of listeners, even though I still retained faith in it. If, therefore, I ventured out of India, I should do so because I have faith, though I cannot demonstrate it to the satisfaction of all, that the message is being surely received by India, be it ever so slowly.”—*Young India*, April 26, 1928.

“ My religion has no geographical limits. If I have a living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India herself. My life is dedicated to service of India through the religion of non-violence, which I believe to be the root of Hindusim.”—*Young India*, August 11, 1920.

इति गान्धिसूत्रेषु सत्याग्रहप्रभेदधर्मो नाम तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥

Thus in the Gandhi Sutras this is the third Chapter entitled :

The Dharma of the varieties of Satyagraha.

APPENDIX

I call myself a Sanatani Hindu, because :—

(1) I believe in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and all that goes by the name of Hindu scriptures and therefore in avatars and rebirth ;

(2) I believe in the Varnashrama Dharma in a sense, in my opinion, strictly Vedic but not in its present popular and crude

(3) I believe in the protection of the cow in its much larger sense than the popular ;

(4) I do not disbelieve in idol-worship.

The reader will note that I have purposely refrained from using the word divine origin in reference to the Vedas or any other scriptures. For I do not believe in the exclusive divinity of the Vedas. I believe the Bible, the Koran and the Zend Avesta to be as much divinely inspired as the Vedas. My belief in the Hindu scriptures does not require me to accept every word and every verse as divinely inspired. Nor do I claim to have any first hand knowledge of these wonderful books. But I do claim to know and feel the truths of the essential teaching of the scriptures. I decline to be bound by any interpretation, however learned it may be, if it is repugnant to reason or moral sense. I do most emphatically repudiate the claim (if they advance any such) of the present Sankaracharyas and Shastris to give a correct interpretation of the Hindu scriptures. On the contrary, I believe, that our present knowledge of these books is in a most chaotic state. I believe implicitly in the Hindu aphorism, that no one truly knows the Shastras who has not attained perfection in Innocence (Ahimsa), Truth (Satya) and Self-control (Brahmacharya) and who has not renounced all acquisition or possession of wealth. I believe in the institution of Gurus, but in this age millions must go without a Guru, because it is a rare thing to find a combination of perfect purity and perfect learning. But one need not despair of ever knowing the truth of one's religion, because the funda-

mentals of Hinduism, as of every great religion, are unchangeable and easily understood. Every Hindu believes in God and His oneness, in rebirth and salvation. But that which distinguishes Hinduism from every other religion is its cow protection, more than its Varnashrama.

Varnashrama is, in my opinion, inherent in human nature and Hinduism has simply reduced it to a science. It does attach to birth. A man cannot change his Varna by choice. Not to abide by one's Varna is to disregard the law of heredity. The division, however, into innumerable castes is an unwarranted liberty taken with the doctrine. The four divisions are all-sufficing.

I do not believe that inter-dining or even inter-marriage necessarily deprives a man of his status that his birth has given him. The four divisions define a man's calling, they do not restrict or regulate social intercourse. The divisions define duties, they confer no privileges. It is, I hold, against the genius of Hinduism to arrogate to oneself a higher status or assign to another a lower. All are born to serve God's creation, a Brahman with his knowledge, a Kshatriya with his power of protection, a Vaishya with his commercial ability and a Shudra with bodily labour. This, however, does not mean that a Brahman, for instance, is absolved from bodily labour or the duty of protecting himself and others. His birth makes a Brahman predominantly a man of knowledge, the fittest by heredity and training to impart learning to others. There is nothing, again, to prevent the Shudra from acquiring all the knowledge he wishes. Only, he will best serve with his body and need not envy others their special qualities for service. But a Brahman who claims superiority by right of knowledge falls and has no knowledge. And so with the others who pride themselves upon their special qualities. Varnashrama is self-restraint and conservation and economy of energy.

Though, therefore, Varnashrama is not affected by inter-dining or inter-marriage, Hinduism does most emphatically discourage inter-dining and inter-marriage between divisions. Hinduism reached the highest limit of self-restraint. It is undoubtedly a religion of renunciation of the flesh so that the spirit may be set free. It is no part of a Hindu's duty to dine with his son. And by restricting his choice of a bride to a particular group, he exer-

cises rare self-restraint. Hinduism does not regard a married state as by any means essential for salvation. Marriage is a fall even as birth is a fall. Salvation is freedom from birth and hence death also. Prohibition against inter-marriage and inter-dining is essential for a rapid evolution of the soul. But this self-denial is no test of Varna. A Brahman may remain a Brahman, though he may dine with his Sudra brother, if he has not left off his duty of service by knowledge. It follows from what I have said above that restraint in matters of marriage and dining is not based upon notions of superiority. A Hindu who refuses to dine with another from a sense of superiority misrepresents his Dharma.

Unfortunately today Hinduism seems to consist merely in eating and not eating. Once I horrified a pious Hindu by taking toast at a Mussalman's house. I saw that he was pained to see me pouring milk into a cup handed by a Mussalman friend, but his anguish knew no bounds when he saw me taking toast at the Mussalman's hands. Hinduism is in danger of losing its substance, if it resolves itself into a matter of elaborate rules as to what and with whom to eat. Abstemiousness from intoxicating drinks and drugs and from all kinds of foods, especially meat, is undoubtedly a great aid to the evolution of the spirit, but it is by no means an end in itself. Many a man eating meat and with everybody, but living in the fear of God, is nearer his freedom than a man religiously abstaining from meat and many other things, but blaspheming God in every one of his acts.

The central fact of Hinduism, however, is cow-protection. Cow-protection to me is one of the most wonderful phenomena in human evolution. It takes the human being beyond his species. The cow to me means the entire sub-human world. Man through the cow is enjoined to realise his identity with all that lives. Why the cow was selected for apotheosis is obvious to me. The cow was in India the best companion. She was the giver of plenty. Not only did she give milk, but she also made agriculture possible. The cow is a poem on pity. One reads pity in the gentle animal. She is the mother to millions of Indian mankind. Protection of the cow means protection of the whole dumb-creation of God. The ancient seer, whoever he was, began with the cow. The appeal of the lower order of creation is the gift of Hinduism.

the world. And Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the cow.

I can no more describe my feeling for Hinduism than for my own wife. She moves me as no other woman in the world can. Not that she has no faults. I dare say she has many more than I see myself. But the feeling of an indissoluble bond is there. Even so I feel for and about Hinduism with all its faults and limitations. Nothing elates me so much as the music of the Gita or the Ramayana by Tulasidas, the only two books in Hinduism I may be said to know. When I fancied I was taking my last breath, the Gita was my solace. I know the vice that is going on today in all the great Hindu shrines, but I love them in spite of their unspeakable failings. There is an interest which I take in them and which I take in no other. I am a reformer through and through. But my zeal never takes me to the rejection of any essential thing of Hinduism. I have said I do not disbelieve in idol worship. An idol does not excite any feeling of veneration in me. But I think that idol worship is part of human nature. We hanker after symbolism. Why should one be more composed in a church than elsewhere? Images are an aid to worship. No Hindu considers an image to be God. I do not consider idol worship a sin.

It is clear from the foregoing, that Hinduism is not an exclusive religion. In it there is room for the worship of all the prophets of the world. It is not a missionary religion in the ordinary sense of the term. It has no doubt absorbed many tribes in its fold, but this absorption has been of evolutionary, imperceptible character. Hinduism tells everyone to worship God according to his own faith or Dharma, and so it lives at peace with all the religions.

That being my conception of Hinduism, I have never been able to reconcile myself to untouchability. I have always regarded it as an excrescence. It is true that it has been handed down to us from generations but so are many evil practices even to this day. I should be ashamed to think that dedication of girls to virtual prostitution was a part of Hinduism. Yet it is practised by Hindus in many parts of India. I consider it positive irreligion to sacrifice goats to Kali and do not consider it a part of Hinduism. Hindu-

ism is a growth of ages. The very name, Hinduism, was given to the religion of the people of Hindustan by foreigners. There was no doubt at one time sacrifice of animals was offered in the name of religion. But it is not religion, much less is it Hindu religion. And so also it seems to me, that when cow-protection became an article of faith with our ancestors, those who persisted in eating beef were excommunicated. The civil strife must have been fierce. Social boycott was applied not only to the recalcitrants, but their sins were visited upon their children also. The practice which had probably its origin in good intentions hardened in usage and even verses crept into our sacred books giving the practice a permanence wholly undeserved and still less justified. Whether my theory is correct or not, untouchability is repugnant to reason and to the instinct of mercy, pity or love. A religion that establishes the worship of the cow cannot possibly countenance or warrant a cruel and inhuman boycott of human being. And I should be content to be torn to pieces rather than disown the suppressed classes. Hindus will certainly never deserve freedom nor get it, if they allow their noble religion to be disgraced by the retention of the taint of untouchability. And as I love Hinduism dearer than life itself, the taint has become for me an intolerable burden. Let us not deny God by denying to a fifth of our race the right of association on an equal footing.—*Young India*, October 6, 1921.

